

Edward N. Greff to be postmaster at Chugwater, Wyo., in place of F. A. Beard, resigned.

John F. Cook to be postmaster at Cody, Wyo., in place of A. P. Libby, removed.

Myra E. Geer to be postmaster at Cokeville, Wyo., in place of A. J. Schils, deceased.

Minnie C. Corum to be postmaster at Encampment, Wyo., in place of M. C. Corum. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Frederick W. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Greybull, Wyo., in place of F. F. Bristow, resigned.

Andrew Morrow to be postmaster at Kemmerer, Wyo., in place of J. H. Mantle, resigned.

Henry J. Wendt to be postmaster at Lander, Wyo., in place of J. G. Bruce, resigned.

Allen T. Frans to be postmaster at Meeteetse, Wyo., in place of A. T. Frans. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1933.

Lilian M. Blackwell to be postmaster at Shoshoni, Wyo., in place of R. E. Chittick, Jr., resigned.

Dorsey T. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Torrington, Wyo., in place of L. E. Eaton, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1934

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Joseph B. Keenan to be Assistant Attorney General.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

George F. Alexander to be district judge, division no. 1, District of Alaska.

J. Earl Major to be United States district judge, southern district of Illinois.

Robert A. Cooper to be United States district judge, District of Puerto Rico.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES, SUPREME COURT, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Anacleto Diaz to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

Leonard S. Goddard to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

Blanton Winship to be Governor of Puerto Rico.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Benjamin J. Horton to be Attorney General of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John W. Holland to be United States attorney, southern district of Florida.

Lawrence S. Camp to be United States attorney, northern district of Georgia.

J. Saxton Daniel to be United States attorney, southern district of Georgia.

Joseph M. Donnelly to be United States attorney, western district of Michigan.

James H. Baldwin to be United States attorney, district of Montana.

James O. Carr to be United States attorney, eastern district of North Carolina.

Marcus Erwin to be United States attorney, western district of North Carolina.

Powless W. Lanier to be United States attorney, district of North Dakota.

Emerich B. Freed to be United States attorney, northern district of Ohio.

Francis Canny to be United States attorney, southern district of Ohio.

William R. Smith, Jr., to be United States attorney, western district of Texas.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Thomas Gaffney to be United States marshal, division no. 2, district of Alaska.

Adam M. Lewis to be United States marshal, northern district of Florida.

George A. Meffan to be United States marshal, district of Idaho.

John J. Murphy to be United States marshal, district of Massachusetts.

William B. Fahy to be United States marshal, eastern district of Missouri.

William F. Goucher to be United States marshal, district of Rhode Island.

James R. Wright to be United States marshal, northern district of Texas.

Albert A. Sanders to be United States marshal, district of Wyoming.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Ralph W. Wescott to be comptroller of customs, district no. 11, Philadelphia, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1934

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, our Father, the Creator and Judge of all the earth; Thou who dost look with mercy on what we are and who reveals what we may be, we pray that Thou wouldst enable us to translate our visions into realities. Grant us largeness of thought, of aspiration, and of liberty. Heavenly Father, may our labors be made musical by the melody of brotherhood. Hearken, O Lord God, we beseech Thee, that with hearts of oak and with breasts of steel our entire citizenship may be summoned in the name of humanity and of good government to cleanse our country of the breeding grounds of crime, which are our greatest public peril. O Thou who art holy and just, we plead for a recovery that shall free our Nation's arteries from these cesspools of iniquity from which come floods of terror, leaving broken hearts and shattered hearthstones in their train. O hasten the dawn of our deliverance. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6670. An act to provide for the establishment of a corporation to aid in the refinancing of farm debts, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 18, 1934, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J.Res. 228. Joint resolution to provide for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-third Congress.

VETERAN RELIEF—ITS RELATION TO CITIZENSHIP

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered before the Chamber of Commerce at Roanoke, Va., January 22, by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. President, members and guests of the Roanoke Chamber of Commerce, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to address you here today, recalling, as I do with much pleasure, my previous visit to Roanoke when I spoke on Armistice Day 1931, before many of your veterans and other citizens of your splendid city. Because of my relation with veterans' affairs, it is but natural that I should choose for discussion with you veteran relief, and

I wish to touch upon a phase of it which has not been given the emphasis I believe it rightly deserves; that is, its relationship to citizenship.

All down through the years from earliest Rome through Elizabethan England and in our own country the problems of veterans' relief has persisted in ever-increasing reverberations, but the emphasis has always been upon the Government's obligation to the veteran, and the matter of the citizen's obligation to his Government has not in my judgment been given the consideration it merits.

I feel strongly that, so far as our country is concerned, there is need for greater interest on the part of our citizens in their own country in the exercise of the rights of citizenship and a more thorough understanding of the machinery of government.

Taken in its full implication the very word "citizen" acquires the dignity of a title. In fact one writer has characterized it as such. He says, "The highest title in the new order of nobility will be neither 'merchant' nor 'scholar', nor yet 'gentleman' in its conventional sense, but 'citizen'—a title rich in its suggestion of public spirit, the recognition of the claims of human brotherhood, the merging of the individual into the higher life of the community, of the Nation, of humanity itself."

However, we are apt to be very casual in our use of this title, giving no thought to the responsibility it connotes. When we say that a man is a citizen of New York, we intend to indicate merely his residence, not his capacity.

Responsibility as a citizen is not a passive one. It is not enough to live our own lives uprightly; it is imperative that we take an active part in the affairs of our community, bringing all our courage and resourcefulness to bear against any evil or unfortunate occurrences which may arise; and in the face of such conditions it is necessary to consider one's self not merely as a citizen of the immediate community but as an integral factor in the welfare of the whole country.

It is this particular attitude that I have in mind in relation to our veterans. For many months past so much has been uttered and written on the subject of veteran relief, voicing deprecation of the burden of its maintenance, the subject had come to be looked upon in many quarters almost as a national grievance, and demands for alleviation of this burden upon the taxpayer grew increasingly insistent and vociferous until the enactment by Congress of the act to maintain the credit of the United States and Public, No. 78. These acts, as most of you no doubt are aware, gave the President broad powers of regulation governing veteran relief and specified certain reductions in payments to veterans and their dependents. Revision of the laws has been effected upon sound principles and comprehending the character of military service, equality in benefits for similar service, consideration of the degree of disability sustained, and financial need for Government aid where direct service origin is not a factor.

It is interesting to note that after the application of the provisions of these new regulations there are still upon our rolls over half a million living veterans and the dependents of over 265,000 deceased veterans who are in receipt of monthly pensions, and 47,000 veterans still remain in our hospitals and homes. Liberalizing regulations approved by the President just last week will serve to increase these totals.

All men who acquired their disabilities in the military or naval service, as well as the dependents of those whose deaths are due to their service, will continue to be adequately cared for, while others of the more seriously disabled veterans are entitled to either a pension, hospital, or domiciliary care.

However, benefits and medical care are now restricted as regards veterans whose partial disability is in no way due to their service; and this procedure, which is in direct consonance with the earliest traditions and customs of our country, coincides with the popular demand of today as influenced by the exigencies of the major national emergency through which we have been passing. Previous to the passage of this legislation and the President's action, hundreds of letters came to me from all over the country voicing strenuous objection to payments being made to veterans who saw no actual combat service; veterans who were able-bodied enough to care for themselves; veterans legally rated as partially disabled, yet able to follow employment requiring physical fitness; and, finally, objection to the domicile in national homes of veterans in receipt of the maximum rate of pension.

It was quite evident that the general feeling was that since thousands of other citizens of our country also were in need of aid through no fault of their own, the veterans who were not disabled by reason of their service should revert to their original status of citizens and meet their difficulties in that capacity along with the others.

It is in such circumstances as these that the true character of citizenship is best manifest. It is quite generally conceded, I believe, that the highest duty and privilege of citizenship is service to one's country in time of great emergency, and it is quite as necessary for us to recognize a national emergency when it occurs in time of peace as when it involves war with another nation. We are passing through just such an emergency, and each difficulty must be met with courage and patience, and a steadfast determination to win through—which shall persist in spite of all obstacles, for we shall win through. America has never failed or quite, and she will not do so now, but whatever is accomplished under the wise and courageous leadership of our President must be achieved by the united and devoted efforts of all the citizenry.

There has never been a time in the history of our country when patriotism and unselfish consideration of the welfare of the coun-

try as a whole was more urgently needed than it is today, and it behooves each of us to give earnest consideration to his or her attitude and endeavor as a citizen.

We are apt to take our patriotism for granted and our citizenship as a status rather than as a personal responsibility, but to be effective in either, we should be constantly active, vigilant, and diligent. Patriotism is not a thing to don like a garment in peace time or to buckle on like a sword in time of war, but must be innate and permanent, not superficial or transitory. Patriotism we see as the very basis of good citizenship. It comprehends and connotes love of country and reverence for its laws; recognition of civic duties; and, defense of country in time of war, not alone as a duty but as the highest privilege of citizenship in fulfillment of an acknowledged obligation to the Government for benefits and protection enjoyed as a citizen.

Service to one's country cannot be evaluated in dollars and cents, but should be spontaneous, without thought of reward. Neither can our gratitude to those who served be rated in such a manner. To the veteran who comes through war unscathed, suffering no impairment, the Government owes its gratitude but—until the time comes, if it should, when assistance is needed—nothing more than it owes to any other loyal citizen. We take pride in providing care and relief for those who have become disabled as the result of rendering war service, but we should as a Nation take equal pride in not seeking Government relief unless we need it.

The principle that service to one's country must thereafter be rewarded by the country, irrespective of need, is contrary to the most elementary tenets of good citizenship, but such expectation with increasing fulfillment has been so widely prevalent after each war in which we have engaged, it has finally attained the prestige of a tradition. We need to get back to that community of interest and ideals upon which our country was founded—based upon the principle that the welfare of the individual was assured only by the welfare of the group. The instinct of self-preservation—aside from any sentiment—taught our forefathers the necessity of standing together. We need to get back to that unity of purpose which perforce held the Colonies together against the menace of outside foes.

We think of ourselves too much only as individuals instead of units in a social whole and correspondingly visualize and pursue our interests more or less selfishly, oblivious of the community of interest which should prevail. There is a clear call to us all today in the conditions which have become more and more prevalent, constituting a menace not only to our ideals and traditions but actually to our security as a nation. On every hand we hear or see evidence of unrest or disregard for the laws of the land, of this or that racket, and one of the most disturbing features prominent in these conditions is the fact that so many of the participants are the young. Someone has said, "The worst that war has done is not the murder of a million bodies but the maiming of a million souls"; and when we stop to consider the moral deterioration that has developed among the youth of the country for lack of schooling, occupation, home care, and employment, we must realize that the maiming of these millions of souls is comparable to the devastation of war. This unrest is not going to be stilled except by a conscientious, deliberate, and determined effort on the part of the citizenry.

Perhaps some of you are even now asking yourselves, "What can I do about it?" and I assure you there is need for each of us to do something very definite about it if we are to fulfill our duties and avail ourselves of our privileges as citizens. There is need for a new spirit of public service and unselfishness that will predominate and so bring about the overthrow of the self-seeker and the greedy—a new and higher standard of civic relationship and civic responsibility.

A good citizen mindful of his country's tradition should consider the significance of its position among the nations of the world as well as its potentialities as an individual nation and, building day by day on this background, assist in preserving the integrity and prestige of his government.

That this responsibility is being widely neglected is evident on every hand. Disregard of law, ridicule of our Congress, of the judiciary, and other men in high public office are prevalent, all of which tend to destroy that confidence in those responsible for the machinery of our Government, which, if carried to the extreme, will undermine the very foundations of good government.

We all know that the American people are much attached to their Government and in every great emergency they have come forward to its defense in the fullest measure. Yet in time of peace, the tendency is to belittle, and interest wanes in those fundamentals of good Government that are essential to its progress and stability. If we are to continue as the great Nation that we have a right to be, it is necessary that there be developed among our people a greater interest in public affairs, a greater appreciation of the value of citizenship.

Patriotism should be an integral part of our every feeling at all times, for it is merely another name for those qualities of soul which make a man in peace or in war, by day or by night, consider his duty to his fellows, and to the Nation through which his and their loftiest aspirations may find fitting expression.

Young America should be taught to love America, to support its Constitution and its laws; to learn that the violation of its laws is desecration of all that is good, and destructive of those high ideals fought for by the fathers of our Nation. Next to love of country should come respect for our institutions and for those who are charged with the responsibility of government. It is equally important, of course, that those selected for public

service should be able to command the confidence essential to inspire proper respect.

However, all these ideals and principles should have their inception in the home and be fostered to the utmost in the schoolroom. I am afraid we expect too much from our teachers in comparison with the compensation and position awarded them. It is of the utmost importance that the initial impression given to the children of America emanate from teachers whose ideals are based upon the true ideals of Americanism, and they should receive salaries commensurate with their responsibilities.

I am of the opinion that the responsibilities patiently and capably borne by the teachers of America are greatly underestimated by the public generally—and certainly as a class they are notoriously underpaid. That the entire educational system of our country has been seriously affected by the prevailing conditions is indicated in the results of a country-wide survey made by the United States Commissioner of Education showing that 800 public schools are closed entirely and 11,000 are operating on a school year of less than 6 months.

When we realize that the entire number of schools operating on full schedule is so utterly inadequate to care properly for the youth of our country, the spectacle of these silent schoolrooms is little less than appalling. There is no activity of our country of greater or more far-reaching importance than efficient functioning of the school. Citizenship is born there. Opportunity and facilities for at least a high-school education should be available to every child in the United States, and it should be so completely and freely accessible that no boy or girl need be deprived of its benefits for lack of textbooks or other necessary school supplies. There is no question but that schools are the very foundation of our citizenship and what young America is taught in them will be the basis of what they do and say later in life.

Notwithstanding our vast and varied national endeavors, I believe the Federal Government has had too little active participation in the function of education, and it is highly gratifying to note indications that under the present administration the scope of Federal participation in educational matters may be broadened, and its activities increased.

Two definite steps in this direction are seen in the educational work now being conducted in the Civilian Conservation Corps, and in the recent establishment of the National Workers' Education Bureau. In the Civilian Conservation Corps, educational advisers will determine at first hand the desires and needs of the corps in educational matters, and efforts will be made to provide such instruction as the members of the corps will be able to acquire in what would otherwise be their idle time, evenings, and rainy days when the regular outdoor work cannot be carried on. The National Workers' Bureau is providing summer courses for workers, and special instruction for the teachers to train them to meet the workers' needs, for instruction in English, social science, current economic problems, and all those things that are closely related to their daily lives.

In a word, the National Workers' Bureau hopes to prepare these young people for intelligent citizenship by giving them a comprehensive knowledge of what is going on around them in social, industrial, and economic activities, and teaching them to think for themselves.

The work is projected through State superintendents of education, and the classes are held in public schools in the regular vacation periods. I feel that this is a highly important work, holding unpredictably splendid possibilities for the future, and I, for one, shall follow the results of its efforts with intense interest.

I feel most earnestly that every step of our educational progress should be outlined in a definite national policy which would include practical instruction in the machinery of government—civic, State, and national—and in order that all educational activities of the country might be properly coordinated, the Government's policy should prescribe minimum requirements which would need to be met by all States wishing their educational programs to be accredited under the Federal system.

We are prone to manifest much pride in our institutions of learning; and while this pride is a worthy one, I do not feel that we are doing nearly enough in the way of education. We have not nearly enough schools; and in those that we have, we do not give our young people adequate preparation for the business of living. Education has been defined as "preparation for the art of living", but, too often, it is merely a sort of intellectual interior decorating.

Education should furnish a definite pattern for living, at least outlining something of the mechanics and technique of that most intricate process; and, with all the cultural embellishment that a boy or girl can and will absorb, there should be always a definite groundwork of some craft, trade, or profession through which they may not only be able to obtain a livelihood but contribute something of practical usefulness to the community of which they are a part. In other words, they should be taught how to be good citizens.

To be a good citizen requires the closest possible adherence to the ideals of Americanism, loyalty in the utmost to those responsible for government, obedience to the laws of the land, and cheerful performance of any public duty required.

We see today entirely too many manifestations of a spirit that is the antithesis of good citizenship. Are we to conclude that the existence of such conditions indicates lack of solidarity in American life; and, if so, must we blame that lack on our long adherence to the melting-pot policy conceived in unselfishness and pursued in the development of that freedom which is the cornerstone of our national structure? Is this precious and dearly

bought freedom degenerating into a laxity that is penetrating and polluting the most vital elements of our national life?

The economic depression has been a fertile field for these elements to prosper, and with such fertilization discontent has spread, with acute occurrences, in this country as well as many others, and these occurrences, while sporadic and more or less transitory in character, are not to be ignored with impunity.

Never before has there been greater need or greater opportunities for the manifestation of Americanism, inviolate and militant, to combat and neutralize the activities and influence of antagonistic forces which would destroy the very fabric of our social structure and tear down the ideals we have reared through the years of our development. Our country was founded on certain great principles fundamental in character. It seems to me in times like those through which we are passing, it is imperative to consider these principles and see to it that we shape our lives in accord with them.

The form and functions of our Government are the result of the independent activity and thought of the people, but with the lapse of time we have settled back into our own more restricted lines of endeavor, leaving the activities of the Government in the hands of a few who have made such matters more or less their life work. It is time that we not only participate individually and actively in the various functions of our civic and national life, but it is more than time that we should establish a definite system, national in scope, which should insure the proper education and preparation of our youth for such eventual duties.

There is a close relationship between education, citizenship, and veterans' relief. The fact that we have a veterans' problem to deal with is due to the fact that we have had either national or international conflicts, which have made it necessary that our citizens be called to the colors. It may be too much to expect within a reasonable time, even with a perfect system of education and the development of the highest type in the standards of citizenship, that we should be able in the future to avoid such conflicts. It is the sincere desire, most certainly, of those who have served in previous conflicts that we may reach such a point. Most assuredly we should make every endeavor to do so.

For these reasons I have developed in this talk to you the matter of education and citizenship, because I feel that there is a marked and direct relationship that will have a most important influence on the future of our country as well as of the other nations of the world.

And now, my friends, before I bid you good night, I wish to thank you for your attention. I earnestly hope that some of you may perceive as a result of these remarks new opportunities for service to your fellow men in your community and that together we may strive hopefully on, keeping ever in mind that ideal, so aptly phrased by the immortal Tennyson:

"Ah! when shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, and universal peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the golden year?"

TO PROHIBIT EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL POLITICAL COMMITTEES FROM HOLDING GOVERNMENT POSITIONS

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRUAX. In that time, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clerk to read a resolution which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 241

To prohibit members and employees of any national political committee from holding Government positions

Resolved, etc., That no officer, member, or employee of a national committee of any political party shall be eligible to hold any Government position, directly or indirectly, under the jurisdiction of any department, bureau, board, commission, or independent agency of the Government.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

IMPEACHMENT OF FEDERAL JUDGE IN MINNESOTA

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a resolution to impeach a Federal judge in the State of Minnesota for enjoining the State of Minnesota from

investigating blue-sky stock transactions by a banking group headed by Wiggins' Chase National Bank of New York. Yesterday afternoon this same judge issued an additional injunction restraining Hennepin County, the county in which the city of Minneapolis is located, from going ahead to investigate stock sales that have been put over. Stock which sold to the people of the State of Minnesota at millions of dollars, at \$100 a share, are now selling at \$6 a share. Our blue-sky commission started an investigation of stock sales in the State of Minnesota, and this Federal judge has enjoined them from going ahead, either criminally or civilly, against those robbers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to introduce into the RECORD another telegram which I received this morning setting forth the later injunction which followed the original, issued several days ago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

F. H. SHOEMAKER,
1005 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Additional injunction today restraining Hennepin County Attorney Goff from starting any action against Northwest Bancorporation. Such proceedings by bank corporation are an admission of guilt. If you can follow suggestions, you will render Minnesota a service. Can you put it over? Answer.

S. T. WOLFE.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—FISCAL YEAR 1935

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7199) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] if we cannot agree now upon some limit for general debate. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have made inquiry of the timekeeper and found that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] has used 2 hours and 31 minutes, and we have used 2 hours and 14 minutes on this side. I am hopeful, if it meets with the approval of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that we can agree on 2 hours and 15 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and 1 hour and 15 minutes by myself.

Mr. SWICK. That will be perfectly agreeable to this side.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill continue for 2 hours and 15 minutes, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] and 1 hour and 15 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7199, the Navy Department appropriation bill, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend Mr. Arthur Brisbane for statements under his signature, appearing in the newspapers of the country on yesterday morning. I will read what Mr. Brisbane said:

Once more be it said, the Government, instead of insisting on bond issues and gigantic interest payments, could and should issue its own currency and pay bills with that. The Government's promise to pay, on green paper bearing no interest would be exactly as good as its promise to pay—plus interest—on yellow paper, and issue currency, instead of a crippling bond issue would help Government credit. A Government, free of a four or five hundred million dollar annual interest load, would have better

credit than with that annual interest burden added to its other obligations.

Who are the congenital usurers, money lenders, and interest grabbers that persuade the President to issue bonds, instead of currency? If the currency would be "inflation" then the bonds would be inflation, plus the added inflation of ten billions in interest charges, added to the ten billions of principal, before the debt could be paid off. An unnecessary interest burden might be the last straw on Uncle Sam's back, leading to a real smash and a dollar really cheap.

In truth and in fact, the Government's interest burden this year will amount to approximately a billion dollars. So Mr. Brisbane raises this question: Why should the Government pay that billion dollars in interest? I want to quote in substance what Mr. Edison said a few years ago when he was asked to go to Muscle Shoals and inspect that project for Mr. Henry Ford, who was contemplating leasing it from the Government for 99 years.

While he was at Muscle Shoals, the New York Times quoted this recognized man of genius and wonderful inventor, whose analysis will be respected by everyone, as follows:

If the currency is issued, \$30,000,000, for financing the finishing construction of Muscle Shoals work, it will be the proper thing to do. Once the currency method is tried in raising money for public improvements, the country will never go back to the bond method.

Make it perfectly clear that I am not advocating any changes in the banks and banking. Banks are a mighty good thing. They are essential to the commerce of the country. It is the money broker, the money profiteer, the private banker, that I oppose. They gain their power through a fictitious and false value given to gold. Gold is a relic of Julius Caesar, and interest is an invention of Satan.

Gold is intrinsically of less utility than most metals. The probable reason why it is retained as the basis of money is that it is easy to control. And it is the control of money that constitutes the money question. It is the control of money that is the root of all evil.

Gold and money are separate things, you see. Gold is the trick mechanism by which you can control money.

Gold is not money until the people of the United States and other nations put their stamp of approval on it. It is not the gold that makes the dollar. It is the dollar that makes the gold. Take the dollar out of the gold, and leave it merely yellow metal, and it sinks in value. Gold is established by law, just as silver was, and gold could be disestablished, demonetized by law, just as silver was. When silver was demonetized the former so-called "dollar" became worth about 50 cents.

There is a complete set of misleading slogans kept on hand for outbreaks of common sense among the people. The people are so ignorant of what they think are the intricacies of the money system that they are easily impressed by big words. There would be new shies of fiat money, and paper money, and greenbackism, and the rest of it—the same old cries with which the people have been shouted down from the beginning.

But maybe we have passed beyond the time when the thoughtful 2 percent—you know, I gather from my questionnaire that only 2 percent of the people think [and Mr. Edison smiled broadly]—maybe they cannot shout down American thinkers any longer. The only dynamite that works in this country is the dynamite of a sound idea. I think we are getting a sound idea on the money question. The people have an instinct which tells them that something is wrong, and that the wrong somehow centers in money. They have an instinct, also, which tells them a proposal is made in their interest or against them.

Now, as to paper money, so-called; everyone knows that paper money is the money of civilized people. The higher you go in civilization the less actual money you see. It is all bills and checks. What are bills and checks? Mere promises and orders. What are they based on? Principally on two sources—human energy and the productive earth. Humanity and the soil—these are the only real bases of money.

Do not allow them to confuse you with the cry of "paper money." The danger of paper money is precisely the danger of gold—if you get too much, it is no good. They say we have all the gold of the world now. Well, what good does it do us? When America gets all the chips in a game the game stops. We would be better off if we had less gold. Indeed, we are trying to get rid of our gold to start something going. But the trade machine is at present jammed. Too much paper money operates the same way. There is just one rule for money, and that is to have enough to carry all the legitimate trade that is waiting to move. Too little or too much are both bad. But enough to move trade, enough to prevent stagnation on the one hand and not enough to permit speculation on the other hand, is the proper ratio.

Then you see no difference between currency and Government bonds? Mr. Edison was asked.

Yes; there is a difference, but it is neither the likeness or the difference that will determine the matter; the attack will be directed against thinking of bonds and currency together and comparing them. If people ever get to thinking of bonds and bills at the same time the game is up.

Now here is Ford proposing to finance Muscle Shoals by an issue of currency. Very well; let us suppose for a moment that Congress follows his proposal. Personally I don't think Congress has imagination enough to do it, but let us suppose that it does. The required sum is authorized—say \$30,000,000. The bills are issued directly by the Government, as all money ought to be. When the workmen are paid off they receive these United States bills. When the material is bought it is paid in these United States bills. Except that perhaps the bills may have the engraving of a water dam instead of a railroad train and a ship as some of the Federal Reserve notes have, they will be the same as any other currency put out by the Government; that is, they will be money. They will be based on the public wealth already in Muscle Shoals; they will be retired by the earnings of the power dam. That is, the people of the United States will have all that they put into Muscle Shoals and all that they can take out for centuries—the endless wealth-making water power of that great Tennessee River—with no tax and no increase of the national debt.

But suppose Congress does not see this, what then? Mr. Edison was asked.

Then Congress must fall back on the old way of doing business. It must authorize an issue of bonds. That is, it must go out to the money brokers and borrow enough of our own national currency to complete great national resources, and we must pay interest to the money brokers for the use of our own money.

That is to say, under the old way, any time we wish to add to the national wealth we are compelled to add to the national debt.

Now, that is what Henry Ford wants to prevent. He thinks it is stupid, and so do I, that for the loan of \$30,000,000 of their own money the people of the United States should be compelled to pay \$66,000,000—that is what it amounts to with interest. People who will not turn a shovelful of dirt nor contribute a pound of material will collect more money from the United States than will the people who supply the material and do the work. That is the terrible thing about interest. In all our great bond issues the interest is always greater than the principal. All of the great public works cost more than twice the actual cost on that account. Under the present system of doing business we simply add 120 to 150 percent to the stated cost.

But here is the point: If our Nation can issue a dollar bond, it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good makes the bill good also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets the money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who directly contribute to Muscle Shoals in some useful way.

If the Government issues bonds it simply induces the money brokers to draw \$30,000,000 out of the other channels of trade and turn it into Muscle Shoals; if the Government issues currency, it provides itself with enough money to increase the national wealth at Muscle Shoals without disturbing the business of the country. And in doing this it increases its income without adding a penny to its debt.

It is absurd to say that our country can issue \$30,000,000 in bonds and not \$30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay; but one promise fattens the usurer, and the other helps the people. If the currency issued by the Government were no good, then the bonds issued would be no good either. It is a terrible situation when the Government to increase the national wealth, must go into debt and submit to ruinous interest charges at the hands of men who control the fictitious values of gold.

Look at it another way. If the Government issue bonds, the brokers will sell them. The bonds will be negotiable; they will be considered as gilt-edged paper. Why? Because the Government is behind them, but who is behind the Government? The people. Therefore it is the people who constitute the basis of Government credit. Why then cannot the people have the benefit of their own gilt-edged credit by receiving non-interest-bearing currency on Muscle Shoals, instead of the bankers receiving the benefit of the people's credit in interest-bearing bonds?

The people must pay anyway; why should they be compelled to pay twice, as the bond system compels them to pay? The people of the United States always accept their Government's currency. If the United States Government will adopt this policy of increasing its national wealth without contributing to the interest collector—for the whole national debt is made up on interest charges—then you will see an era of progress and prosperity in this country such as could never have come otherwise.

I wish every Member of Congress—House and Senate—would take the time to read this statement carefully. It is the best statement on the important issues before the people today that I have ever read.

PAY NATIONAL DEBT WITH NEW MONEY

I know that if you were to make the statement here this morning that we could issue \$22,000,000,000 in money and take up all the Government bonds, many of our people would be alarmed and say: "Why, that will call for \$220,000,000,000 of inflation; it will absolutely destroy our country." And according to the present banking set-up that argument could not be satisfactorily answered. It could cause, I admit, a potential inflation of \$220,000,000,000. But there is a way of correcting this situation. We could pay off the na-

tional debt, if it were desired, and not have a dollar of inflation. Here is the way I would do it if it were within my power to do it. At least, I can suggest how it may be done.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Did the gentleman mean to state \$220,000,000,000?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. Twenty-two billion dollars is the amount of our national debt and the banks can expand each dollar 10 times, so this could call for a potential inflation of \$220,000,000,000. The banks can lend \$10 to every \$1 of actual money in their possession.

Today we have in circulation, theoretically, \$5,000,000,000 in money. The banks of the country hold less than \$1,000,000,000 in their vaults to pay their depositors, but that is not all the money they have. They have approximately \$2,000,000,000 with the Federal Reserve System that they can get very quickly for the purpose of paying their depositors. The banks owe their depositors approximately \$40,000,000,000.

Now, suppose we were to adopt a program of gradually retiring the national debt with new money—and it should be done gradually; it should not be done quickly—in the end we will have paid \$22,000,000,000 to the holders of Government tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds. They will get this payment in new money. This money will go very quickly to the banks in the country and be deposited. Then instead of the banks having on deposit \$40,000,000,000 they will have on deposit \$62,000,000,000; and instead of having \$3,000,000,000 with which to pay those deposits they will have \$25,000,000,000, a ratio of 1 to 2½.

As you issue this money and put it in circulation you can prevent inflation by raising the reserve requirements of the banks, so you can say then that no bank can issue more than \$2.50 for every \$1 of reserve; and there would not necessarily be any undue inflation at all. Why should there be? As you increase the volume of money you raise the reserve requirements of the banks. You can absolutely prevent undue inflation; and then instead of people having to rely upon borrowing money from the banks and paying interest on it they could have sufficient money for hand-to-hand transactions and not be reduced to barter.

MONEY FOR TRADE AND PRODUCTION

Furthermore, the people who hold \$22,000,000,000 in bonds when they receive this money will want to put it to some useful purpose. In order to do this they will have to invest it; it will be forced into the channels of production and trade rather than being invested in tax-exempt interest-bearing bonds.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

Now, if there is any answer to this argument, I wish somebody would make it. I have heard this question discussed all over the country by the greatest economists and financiers, and I have every reason to believe that it is sound. I see no reason why it is not sound.

Why should the Government pay interest on its own obligations? Think of the inconsistency of the Government issuing a \$1,000 bond and selling it to a bank here in Washington, and the bank in Washington taking the same bond, which is a debt that is secured by the credit of this Nation, to the Treasury, and getting \$1,000 in new money, with the exception of 5 percent that is left there as a reserve.

SECURITY BEHIND MONEY

What secures this new money? Nothing on earth except the Government obligation, which is a Government debt. In other words, the money is issued upon a debt of the Government. So why issue that bond? Why not issue the money and let it be paid directly, for upon it there will be no interest? Let me repeat, Why issue a bond, sell the bond, and then issue money upon the bond or collateral security? Why not issue the money in the first instance?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is touching upon a subject to which some people in this country have given a great deal of thought—why the Government should pay interest on its obligations. Some of our best economists cannot understand that, because the Government can take the money. Furthermore, the people are more concerned with the return of principal than they are with the earning of interest, especially after the experience of recent years. Now, instead of retiring the national debt by new currency, why should not the Government educate the people of America to take its obligations without interest? Because many people cannot understand why the Government ever should pay interest on its obligations. However, I could not go as far as the gentleman in issuing currency. Why could not the Government reissue obligations without interest?

Mr. PATMAN. What is the difference in the main? The gentleman says he would be willing for the bonds to be issued without interest. They are negotiable; they will be used as money.

Mr. O'CONNOR. They might be termed bonds. They might not be redeemable out of the Treasury for certain periods of time, unlike currency.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman tell the Committee what he thinks is the essential difference between small, non-interest-bearing bonds in circulation and currency of like denomination?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no difference except this: If currency is issued it may be used by the banks for the issuance of additional deposit currency while the bonds could not be used for that purpose.

There are many ways in which we can do this, either by the issuance of bonds of small denomination, non-interest-bearing bonds, or the issuance of money. Regardless of what you call the obligations so issued, the same principle is involved. The people do sufficient business with the Government to safely authorize such currency issue to be redeemable in services or used for taxpaying purposes. It could be made good for the purchase of stamps or any kind of mail service, payments due the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, taxes due the Treasury, including income, inheritance, alcoholic beverage, gasoline, check, and tobacco, and for many other purposes.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

I want to say a word about the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve member banks have never invested more than \$160,000,000 in the System. It cannot be claimed that they have been doing the enormous business they have on that small capitalization. This is insignificant; it is nothing compared to the fifty to one hundred billion dollars worth of business done by these institutions. Mr. W. P. G. Harding, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, on June 28, 1922, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and in this testimony he made certain statements.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks certain extracts from his testimony, as well as Mr. Edison's quoted statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

Mr. PATMAN. He testified that the member banks had only invested some 3 percent of their capital and surplus in the Federal Reserve banks. They were not required, as contemplated by the law, to invest at least 6 percent, and Mr. Harding stated that it is not the intention of the Federal Reserve Board to ever call upon those member banks for the other 3 percent because the Federal Reserve banks do not need it. Why? Because they are backed by the credit of this Nation. Every Federal Reserve note that they have issued is not redeemable by the Federal Reserve banks. No. They do not promise to redeem them. Those notes are redeemable by the Government of the United States. It is

a mortgage on all the property of all the people of this Nation. It is a mortgage on all the incomes of all the people. It is a blanket mortgage. They get the benefit of the Government credit; therefore it enables them to do business on this very small, insignificant capitalization. They also use this great privilege free of charge and pay no taxes, except on the small amount of real estate they own.

The Federal Reserve banks during the last 2 or 3 years have purchased \$2,437,000,000 worth of Government securities. This is the amount that they held at the end of December. What did they buy those securities with? They bought those securities with Government credit; they bought Government obligations with Government credit, and the Government is paying the Federal Reserve banks interest on obligations that were bought with the credit of the Government. Is that right? Can you justify it? Is there any way on earth that you can give an excuse for that kind of thing? You cannot. There is no way to do it. The Federal Reserve banks will get enough each year as interest on those bonds to pay one half their entire paid-in capital stock. In other words, the equivalent of a 50-percent dividend is given to them each year on Government obligations alone and not have their \$160,000,000 invested at all. There is no way for you to give a reasonable excuse for the continuance of such a situation.

TAKE OVER FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Federal Reserve banks, I believe, should be taken over by the Government. I think the activities of the Federal Reserve banks and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be coordinated in some way so that the credit of this great Nation can be used in the interest of all the people instead of allowing it to be used for a special few.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NATIONAL INCOME FELL 40 PERCENT IN 4 YEARS

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce has just made public a report showing that total income distributed to individuals throughout the Nation was \$81,000,000,000 in 1929, but dropped to \$49,000,000,000 in 1932, a decline of 40 percent.

Wages have suffered most severely in the general decline since 1929, with a falling off of 60 percent in those industries in which it was possible to segregate this item. Salaries dropped 40 percent, much less rapidly than wages, with the most severe curtailment occurring in 1932.

A significant divergence in declining trends is apparent as between labor income and property income; by 1932 the former had fallen off 40 percent, while property income distributed receded by 30 percent.

Wages totaled \$52,867,000,000 in 1929; \$48,688,000,000 in 1930; \$41,027,000,000 in 1931, and \$31,595,000,000 in 1932.

Income distributed by agriculture dropped from \$6,341,000,000 in 1929 to \$3,442,000,000 in 1932. In mining the drop was from \$2,123,000,000 in 1929 to \$851,000,000 in 1932. The figures for manufacturing were \$18,157,000,000 in 1929 and \$8,373,000,000 in 1932, while income paid out by construction decreased from \$3,135,000,000 in 1929 to \$864,000,000 in 1932.

INTEREST PAYMENTS REMAIN STATIONARY

On the other hand, interest payment remained almost stationary during the 4 years of the report, being \$5,687,000,000 in 1929, \$5,826,000,000 in 1930, \$5,662,000,000 in 1931, and \$5,506,000,000 in 1932. This part of the report shows that the people will meet their contractual obligations if it is at all possible for them to do so. It further shows that there was more money paid out each of the years for interest than there was actual money in circulation.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, next to the group of persons who spend all of their time thinking up ways to exploit the consumer, I believe the most dangerous are those who, under the guise of protecting the consumer, attempt to destroy honest industry. In the latter group are those who write books for personal profit exposing industry.

On behalf of the consumer these self-appointed protectors, who, as far as is known, have contributed nothing to

the progress of this country, would with one stroke destroy industry and set themselves up as the supreme court to render decisions as to the worth of consumer products.

Strange as it may seem, I believe that a very large part of our manufacturers who make goods for public consumption are honest and have the consumer's interest at heart. How could they survive and prosper if they did not please the consumer? After all, merit is the gage of consumer acceptance.

I do not believe in discontinuing the service of advertising, for it is through this service that the consumer is kept informed and publications maintain their high standards. It may be necessary to control advertising to some extent, but it must not be killed as a consumer's service.

There has been an inspired clamoring for food and drugs legislation. To bring this about a few horrible examples of bad products and trade practices have been exhibited throughout the country by a Government department. A considerable sum of money has been expended in this campaign to stir up a feeling against our present Pure Food and Drugs Act, which is recognized by legal authorities throughout the world as an effective measure for consumer protection. Other countries have studied this law and have used it as a model for their food and drugs laws.

Yet the public would be led to believe that they have been unprotected; that they have been victims of a conspiracy on the part of food and drugs manufacturers to flood the country with deleterious products and poisonous foods. The fact is that no country in the world has a higher standard for food and drugs than has the United States.

Ownership of the industries in this group is represented by thousands of consumer stockholders. They give employment to millions of consumers in their own and allied industries. Millions have been invested by these industries in research and methods to improve their products and to bring them to the public conveniently and fresh.

It is difficult to believe that opponents of the suggested drastic legislation are all disreputable and dishonest manufacturers. They do have a selfish interest, perhaps, just as those zealots who write books for profit have a selfish interest. If the latter succeed in killing the service of advertising, the public would depend upon them for information about products of every description.

Let us have food and drug legislation that will stamp out fakes, frauds, parasites, deceivers, but let us have legislation that is not only fair to the public but to the people who try to do business with the public. Let us amend the Food and Drugs Act and let us have a Food and Drug Administration that can enforce the law and not one that spends so much of its time drafting and lobbying for new legislation designed to put honest industry in a strait-jacket.

PENDING FOOD AND DRUG LEGISLATION

One question involved in the dispute over proposed new food and drug legislation is whether we shall have legislation by Congress and enforcement by courts, as now, or legislation and enforcement by a Government officer in the Department of Agriculture.

The Federal food and drugs law was enacted in 1906. It prohibits the shipment or sale in interstate commerce of adulterated and misbranded food and drugs. Under it, the Government has instituted over 22,000 cases, and truthfulness on packages, labels, and circulars has, in the main, been achieved.

A criticism of the existing law is that it does not apply to advertising—that a manufacturer may make claims through the press and over the radio that he does not and cannot make on cartons and labels. It is easy to understand this criticism. Legislation to curb it seems necessary, although the codes of the various industries affected provide for such control.

Another complaint of the present law is that it does not apply to cosmetics, which have developed into a major industry since the law was enacted.

Instead of offering amendments to the existing law to effect changes in these various respects, or instead of a new bill to meet the same purposes, the Department of

Agriculture brought out and sponsored a bill to repeal the existing law, change the entire theory underlying it, and set up a new, intricate, and involved law which would vest in the Secretary of Agriculture broad and almost unsupervised legislative, executive, and judicial powers. It is known as the "Tugwell bill."

Briefly stated, the criticism of the Tugwell bill is that it is a skeletonized bill which defines in general, broad terms, spheres of authority, and then empowers a Government officer, by regulations of his own making, to round out and expand (1) the legislative provisions of the bill, (2) the executive powers, and (3) the judicial functions.

The bill was heard before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce in Washington on the 7th and 8th of last December. Many witnesses, representing publishers, advertising agencies, manufacturers of foods, drugs and cosmetics, trade associations, women's clubs, other groups, and the public, spoke in opposition to the bill as drawn. With few exceptions, if any, the speakers declared their agreement with the avowed purposes and aims of the bill, and addressed their criticisms to specific provisions of the proposed legislation.

THE REVISED TUGWELL BILL (S. 2000)

On January 4 Senator COPELAND introduced in the Senate a new bill drawn in the light of criticisms and suggestions expressed at the hearings. This new bill, identified as Senate bill no. 2000, is evidence of the validity of many of the criticisms made of the Tugwell bill.

The Copeland bill is a revision of the Tugwell bill, which it has followed, section for section. In some sections the language is retained.

The substantive provisions of the old bill are changed somewhat in the new bill. As in the case of the original Tugwell bill, the purpose and effect of this new measure can be stated in a few words: (1) Bureaucratic domination and control of the food, drug, and cosmetic industries is retained, hidden somewhat, but any careful analysis of the new bill discloses this fact; (2) it is even more adapted to the prevention of self-administration of drugs than if the original bill had been enacted; (3) there are more complete provisions to secure a reversal of existing court decisions than are found in the original bill; (4) the regulations of advertising is to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture and in as great an extent as in the original bill. Publishers and advertising agencies are still permitted to evade responsibility by turning State's evidence.

The purpose and effect of the revised Tugwell bill insofar as its substantive provisions are concerned are the same as the original.

The procedural provisions of the revised Tugwell bill are changed in some particulars.

There has been retained in the new Tugwell bill the provisions of the old bill relating to permits, factory inspection, multiple seizures, penalties for technical violations, injunction proceedings, provisions relating to exports, and publicity.

The definition of advertising still includes representations of opinion, bringing in a wide range of discretionary interpretations that will tend to suppress even necessary descriptive expressions in advertising copy.

The term "palliation" included in this bill does not convey any specific meaning in law, as no definite knowledge exists as to the exact pathological effects of certain drugs upon the human system.

The requirement that the label be supported by demonstrable scientific facts, subjects all labels to a discretionary determination of the basis for such facts.

Under the misbranding section, a drug is deemed to be misbranded solely because it may fail to carry a word or statement which may tend to avoid adulteration or misbranding as viewed by the administrators of the law. The discretionary interpretations that may result from the application of this provision provide no assurance to the manufacturer that his label may be acceptable for any extended period of time.

Food standards are still to be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary. It may be pertinent to ask

why such standards cannot be determined at the time the bill is drafted. Surely the manufacturer—with millions of dollars invested in scientifically developed processes for foods—is entitled to reasonable assurance that his investment may not be worthless at the scratch of a pen.

Manufacturers should have no objection to a declaration of substances possessing stimulant-depressant properties, but the wisdom of granting discretionary powers to a Secretary for the determination of other drugs to come within this category should be seriously questioned.

A drug is deemed to be misbranded if it fails to bear complete and explicit directions for use. It should be noted that the completeness and explicitness of the directions are solely to be determined by regulations promulgated by the Secretary, whose discretionary powers are then further broadened to include such indefinite requirements as the determination of what may be dangerous to health, dosage, or "methods of administration." The Secretary must then become prescribing physician for the administration of all drugs.

If an advertisement is unmistakably false, it is not within the province of the Secretary to declare it legal because of its appearance in a scientific publication. Yet provision is made in this bill specifically exempting such violations.

The exemption of minor violations from the institution of libel or injunction proceedings is, of course, at the discretion of the Secretary, with no requirement actually limiting his powers however minor the violation may be. To afford protection to industry it would seem desirable that some provision be included to prevent arbitrary or capricious actions of the administration in these "minor" instances. There is no reason to suppose that all officials will remain impartial and unprejudiced in the administration of this law.

Relative to seizures, protection is afforded administrative officials against damage suits resulting from the discretionary application of provisions of the law. In an equitably drafted law no cause for action would arise against an administrative official. This provision, therefore, encourages oppressive and bureaucratic interpretations under the cloak of immunity from personal liability.

The practice of instituting simultaneous seizures in many jurisdictions would be continued to the injury of legitimate industry without tangible benefits to the public interest. Multiple seizures should be authorized only in such cases where adulteration is immediately dangerous to public health.

Industry is entitled to some protection against the despotic acts of bureaucracy, and if the law cannot be so written that it is specific in its application, then the acts of administrative officials resulting from discretionary interpretations should be answerable in a court of law.

No protection is afforded the formulae and the secret processes that constitute the most valuable asset of the large majority of manufacturers in the food, drug, and cosmetic industries because of the restrictions of the term "patentable processes." The dissemination of information outside of the scope of administrative office being limited only to such "patentable processes" assures these industries no protection whatsoever.

The delegation of the power to legislate to a board of five members designated by the President is a grant of congressional prerogative open to question as to its constitutionality. The requirement that members of this board are to aid and advise the Secretary in the promulgation of regulations for the protection of public health is clearly legislative in character, such right of legislation heretofore remaining in the hands of Congress. The designation that members should be selected for their distinguished scientific attainment is indeed interesting in view of the fact that none of the members can have a financial interest in the manufacture, advertising, or sale of any food, drug, or cosmetic. It would be difficult to name an individual of such "scientific attainment" who remains utterly detached from the commercial phase of pharmacy or medicine. In fairness to industry, some representation should be provided

upon any board whose duties are to determine the practical application of regulations promulgated by the Secretary. The intricate problems arising in the manufacture and marketing of not only drugs but foods and cosmetics warrant some consideration toward the selection of competent members who have some knowledge of business practice.

It is my belief that the logical solution of the problem of further safeguarding the consumer in a manner justly considerate of the problems of the manufacturer in conforming to such safeguarding will be found in H.R. 6376, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on January 4, 1934.

THE BLACK BILL (H.R. 6376)

The purpose of this bill is to correct defects existing in the Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, and to modernize the act in order that adequate protection may be secured for the consuming public. At the same time it safeguards against fantastic legislation and preserves all of the present adequate provisions of the Food and Drugs Act as interpreted by the courts. The Black bill offers amendments to the present law which would:

First. Extend the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act to cosmetics, beauty preparations, and devices to affect the structure or functions of the body.

Second. Require manufacturers, packers, sellers, or distributors of products to place their true names and addresses thereon.

Third. Provide that notice and hearing be given by the Government to persons primarily responsible for alleged violations of regulations under the statute, prior to the institution of prosecutions, with reasonable opportunity to such persons to effect compliance with official rulings and provide for a certification of compliance by the Secretary.

Fourth. Limit prosecutions for alleged violations to one court action, but with power in that court to enjoin the interstate sale of articles involved pending decision of the controversy.

Fifth. Give emergency powers to the Government to effect summary protection of the public interest by impounding drugs flagrantly misbranded.

Sixth. Give jurisdiction over the advertising independently of the label of foods, drugs, and cosmetics to a bureau of the Department of Agriculture, that bureau, after due notice and hearing, to issue cease and desist orders against advertising found to be false, with provision that prompt compliance with such cease and desist orders be made upon penalty of prosecution and punishment by fine or imprisonment.

I believe the public would be better served by a bill couched in plain, understandable, and explicit terms, with as little opportunity as possible left for its alteration by regulation and varying departmental ideas. I believe H.R. 6376 accomplishes this purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunately unable to be here during the latter part of last session. Early this session, however, I asked the Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—and I have requested him to be present today—if he would not call a meeting of that committee in order that I, the ranking Member on the minority thereon, might know what bills or resolutions had been referred to it. Last year it was suggested that as I had had 11 years of service in the Congress I should have some more important committee assignment than heretofore and that I be placed on the Committee on Expenditures, which was no longer to be a merely dormant one but would probably sit much of the time. I accepted this assignment willingly since it appeared to be an important one.

When I courteously suggested to the chairman of the committee that a meeting thereof be called, so that I might obtain some information as to what was in prospect, there was an apparent unwillingness on his part to accede to my suggestion. A few days later I repeated my request and his reply was "What do you want to do, uncover graft and cor-

ruption?" I answered, "No, indeed; the country cannot stand that sort of thing, but I do wish to question the advisability of some of these current expenditures, and the methods used in making them." He demanded to know what I had in mind. I said, "Well, whether or not it really is sound policy to continue giving more of the Federal funds to wealthy States and wealthy towns which should be able to provide for their own."

When interviewed by representatives of the press, I suggested that they talk personally with the chairman, for whom I have real personal liking and a great deal of respect. He is indeed a lovable man and I believe that he would make a remarkable investigator if allowed to act in that capacity. To them he stated in effect that I was looking for a cheap show. In reply to that insinuation I would ask those who have served with me for 11 years when I have ever forfeited their respect by seeking for notoriety. No; it is not that, but as ranking minority member on this committee I certainly feel some responsibility to those who placed me there and to the country at large to see to it, if possible, that these current huge expenditures be fairly examined.

It is a fact that towns with tax rates of less than \$20—wealthy towns with not a dollar of indebtedness—are taking money from the Federal Treasury, which is faced with a debt of \$32,000,000,000; and last Saturday I had to vote to split the dollar in half and for other features of the monetary revaluation bill because I must needs back up the President, lest the bankers whom he has excoriated fail to help in the great financial operations now in prospect.

When is a nation bankrupt? Just how much can we owe? With more than \$3,000,000,000 of ordinary expense every year and with less than \$3,000,000,000 of income, after having killed the goose that laid the golden egg and gave us \$2,250,000,000 in income and corporation taxes—having locked the barn door of banking and business after the horse had been stolen, and, as a friend wrote me the other day, "locked it so tight that we cannot use the barn any more"—what is our present situation?

We courageously voted that our President should have all the money which he demanded for relief, namely \$3,300,000 last year. When November arrived he found that the same thing existed as had existed under the former administration—that organization, planning, governmental red tape, and all that sort of thing had prevented the spending of all but a comparatively small amount for actual relief of unemployment.

I recall that on January 25 of last year I made a brief speech on the floor of this House and cited the failure of the Home Loan Bank, whereupon the gentleman from South Carolina said to me with much emphasis, as you may recall, "After March 4 things will move." After March 4 that same gentleman was made chairman of the new Home Owners' Loan Corporation Board. Things were certainly supposed to move then. Did they? Oh, what a record. Up to the middle of December—and I have figures available to prove it—scarcely any relief had been given to distressed home owners. There was more organization, there were more rules and regulations, and more and more delays, but foreclosures went on and on. The actual results of most of these relief measures were most disheartening. Federal banks bursting with money, but member banks not daring to borrow. The chairman of the R.F.C. tells the banks to loosen up; the Comptroller of the Currency travels about making speeches and urging banks to do business, even advising the making of loans on good character.

It has been stated that the failure of the recovery program of the N.R.A.—or the proportion of its failure—is to be laid to the banks because they have not properly cooperated. But just visit your own banks after the national-bank examiner has been there, putting the fear of God into them by such instructions as this: "Don't you dare to lend another dollar on real estate as security or to that person whose credit is based on real estate", and after they have been subjected to criticisms which have actually resulted in banks withdrawing from business because they did not dare to carry it on. Agencies of the Government are working at

cross-purposes, gentlemen. Within the last few days I have once more learned that banks in my own district have still borrowed nothing from the Federal Reserve bank to help business in their communities. When is the fear which has restrained them from doing so to disappear? Not so long as these governmental threats and this spending spree continue.

Then I look over the P.W.A. program, for which I voted last year. I was very willing to vote a grant of 30 percent of the cost of municipal projects which would result in local improvements and be worth while in future years. But last November came and the P.W.A. had woefully failed to function as it was intended that it should function in all those many, many months. Someone had to think of something else at once. Perhaps if Mr. Hoover had proposed it he would have been reelected President; that is, if the Democratic Congress could have been persuaded to back him up. They thought of practically giving away a huge sum of money—\$400,000,000—and giving it away in a hurry. Some of it must reach the people's pockets by Christmas. You and I have many letters from constituents praising Mr. Roosevelt because their Christmas was made happier, and I rejoice with those who received this needed aid. There is no question of that need in countless instances. But that is only one side of the picture. Many wealthy communities and units promptly jumped in and grabbed a lot of this relief money, spending it on things which they, as municipalities, should never have spent it for. The same is true of individuals. Possibly a million men have been placed on C.W.A. pay rolls who would not have had a job even in good times. It cannot be denied that in countless instances the deserving have failed to secure help because those who were not deserving got it. "Canned music" had thrown many musicians out of employment. That they needed work is unquestionable, but many have been given jobs simply to furnish entertainment for the public. Shades of the Caesars. That is what happened in Rome in the days of the public circuses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I may appear to be critical. I am critical of many of the methods which have been employed, but I am, nevertheless, backing the President. I even voted for his revolutionary proposals when many of my friends thought that I should not. If he asks for a billion dollars more, even if it is to be spent in the same manner, I shall probably vote as he requests. God knows I shall have to; he is the only President I have. If this is the only method of relief which he offers, I must support it, for the need is great.

Nevertheless, I do want a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures. Gently, oh, so gently, have I requested it. There are only 6 of the minority party against 15 of the majority on that committee, so what show have we got? I simply wish to call Mr. Hopkins down here and find out from him if it is not in fact true that greedy, rich municipalities that did not need this relief money have been taking it—taking it from those which did—and spending it on useless projects. Now, most of the P.W.A. projects are in a different category. They are permanent and worthwhile.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is the gist of my remarks this afternoon.

Confronted with only one method of bringing direct relief to our people, I am voting with the President. Just the same, I should like to have Mr. Hopkins and a few others appear before a real congressional committee, to pass on the advisability or inadvisability of giving away vast sums of money without due consideration and reasonable restraints. And my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], would, I am sure, be the one most anxious and able to settle the question as to whether this has been done and how we are to proceed in the future.

Since we had our little discussion I have received scores of communications asking me to investigate scandals in different localities. The newspapers have lately been filled with comments and criticisms along the same lines. There

is certainly nothing secret about this now, and our committee was created to pass on expenditures by the Executive and, as a corollary, should hear reasonable and proper complaints. I observe that this morning's newspapers have called this giving-away proposition "the politicians' paradise." Municipalities complain because they were urged, or commanded, in the strongest terms to present C.W.A. projects in great haste, before they could properly consider the situation. Now, after they have got projects started and materials purchased they are ordered to "taper off" on employment. This tapering off will be most difficult to do, and hopes, but recently aroused, are now to be shattered.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not think there is any politics in the C.W.A., because in Minnesota no man can get a job unless he is a Farmer-Laborite. [Laughter.]

Mr. GIFFORD. I said that if Mr. Hoover had only thought of this giving away money, I think he would have been elected. I do not know whether there is any politics in it or not, I do not know what the motive was, but you on the other side of the House feel happy about it. One Member over there said to me, "Well, we put something over on you that time, did we?" Well, I think you did, and you may have made a lot of votes. But, has our Government come to that?

Now, as I say, I asked the chairman to call this meeting. He well knows what I would do, if I were chairman. Perhaps I should thank heaven that I am in a position where it ought not to worry me; but it does. It is my duty to see that this committee performs its functions. I represent a section of the country where the people do their own thinking. I know that they expect me to do the same and do my duty.

I hope that the leaders on the other side have not taken the stand of asking the chairman of the committee not to call it together. The President himself is trying to clean house of the politicians who are using his administration for profitable practices. The indications are that he wishes matters to be aired and debated. Why, then, do you further resist this request? You are 15 to 6 on the committee and can whitewash any investigation if you choose to do so. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, another distinguished orator is added to the heavy artillery on the Republican side, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] joining the ranks; but able as he is, he is so lacking in information that his shots at the administration do not even make a small dent. When Congress met a few weeks ago, the guns of the enemy were trained on the administration. We heard from General FISH, General CROWTHER, General TABER, and others. Now comes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. Like the previous attacks, the gentleman from Massachusetts fails to make an impression, owing, I think, to his lack of understanding of the operations of our relief agencies.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him, and I will not interrupt him further? I meant to have stated that not a single Member on my side of the House has spoken to me in regard to this, nor has any one of the Republican leaders said anything about it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. While I did not yield to the gentleman, and do not want this taken out of my time, it is evident from what has just been said that the gentleman proceeded on his own initiative. The gentleman seems peeved because I have not called a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures to investigate the spending of money by the Public Works Administration and the Civil Works Administration. He wants an investigation, but he cannot produce any evidence of fraud of any kind. He seeks information that is contained in the monthly reports of the Administrator of the P.W.A. and the Administrator of the C.W.A. Then the gentleman complains because some of the

towns of his district with small tax rates, wealthy towns, having no debts, are taking money from the C.W.A. at a time, he says, when the Government is facing an indebtedness of \$32,000,000,000. Why does the gentleman complain here about what the officials in his towns do? They were not forced to accept the money. They accepted it, or it would not have been allocated. If the gentleman would stop for a moment to reason, he could realize why they accepted the money. I will advise him. Being wealthy communities, as he says, naturally they pay taxes to the United States Government. The money is being allocated to all cities and towns for relief purposes; and if they did not accept their portion of this money, the officials would find themselves in the position of paying taxes to be distributed among other cities and towns, with no direct benefit to them.

So what do they do? Like all other cities, they ask for their share. The gentleman spoke of the P.W.A. and made the statement that November came and this Administration did not function. If he will consult the record, he will find that nearly all the \$3,300,000,000 was allocated by November. It has all been allocated now and the Administrator has warned States, counties, and cities that if they do not proceed with the improvements for which money was allocated he will revoke the grant. Is there any evidence there that the Public Works Administration has not functioned? It not only has functioned but is functioning now and, when Congress grants additional money for public works, it will be in a position to allocate immediately this money as applications are being approved daily and are held in abeyance awaiting action by Congress. Of course, we will not act until the President sends in his request, but we are informed that will be along in a very short time.

It is hard for me to conceive that the gentleman, who has been here so long and who has rendered such valuable service in the past, does not know how fast the Public Works Administration acted upon applications filed by the States and local communities. I can tell him that if he will just look at the record he will see that what I tell him is true and that, when weather permits, the projects not already started will be started. In the meantime the mills have been contacted and are now turning out material to be used in these projects. Look up the record of the Army Engineers and see if they have loafed on the job. They were ready, and practically all the large contracts have been let. "Gently I have asked for a meeting of the committee. I want to talk to Mr. Hopkins. I want information about those greedy, wealthy municipalities that took C.W.A. money", said Mr. Gifford in his speech. What information can Mr. Hopkins give him other than to say that the wealthy municipalities requested the money and it was allocated. It is from the officials of the municipalities that he should secure his information. The gentleman said he hoped the leaders on the Democratic side had not taken a stand against a committee meeting. The gentleman can be assured they have not. I accept the entire responsibility and I have no apology to make. I told the gentleman to produce some facts and he could have a meeting.

As the gentleman knows, I like to go fishing; that is my hobby. I am willing to go on a fishing expedition any time; but if I do, I am going to insist that the gentleman furnish the bait. [Laughter.] As soon as the gentleman, in the opinion of the chairman of the committee, furnishes any evidence that is worthy of consideration, there will be a meeting of the committee. But there is not going to be a meeting of the committee, as far as I am concerned, simply for the purpose of letting the gentleman throw mud at the administration.

Now, as to the P.W.A. and the C.W.A., everybody admits that the money is spent fast. The P.W.A. has done a wonderful job although my city has so far been denied money for our post office, a project for which Congress not only authorized the money but appropriated the money, and it was taken under authority granted in the Economy Act by the President and used for the Civilian Conservation Corps. There was a reason for the failure of the Director of the Budget and the Administration of Public Works in not allo-

ating the amount asked for this project by the Treasury Department. The P.W.A. is willing to give us the \$3,100,000 Congress appropriated, but the Treasury Department now says it needs \$5,350,000 to complete the job. I hope the controversy will soon be settled, and I think it will. The P.W.A. allocated money for projects authorized by Congress and we should not condemn the Administrator for that. He simply expedited the project to place the unemployed to work. That is what we gave them the money for. If you are in doubt as to this, consult the hearings before the committees. Everybody admits, if we had had time to work out a program, that probably we would have got more benefit out of the Civil Works Administration than we really will get, but in October last 11 percent of the people of the United States were on the unemployed relief roll, and something had to be done. What were we going to do? We had a man in the White House who figured out a way to go, and rather than simply have these people walk up week after week and receive a contribution from the local, State, and Federal relief rolls, they devised the C.W.A. Is it not better to let a man earn a few dollars so that he can walk home at night holding his head up and say that he has earned this money to feed his children rather than to have him go into the breadline and beg something from a charitable organization?

As far as I am concerned, I am willing to spend twice the amount that we have spent, if it is necessary, to feed the unemployed in this country. If you had not put the men to work, it would have been necessary to allocate the money through relief agencies, because the people must be fed. You are going to have lots of complaints. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] says that I have had them from St. Louis. I have not. I received only one complaint from his State, and he had a copy of the letter. The gentleman would break down the C.W.A., which would mean he would put 4,000,000 men back in the bread line to beg for their families. I can only say that those who oppose such a policy as we have inaugurated temporarily must never have felt the pinch. The President knows what he is doing. Let us help him rather than impede his progress. If any official—Federal, State, or local—has misused this fund—money advanced to feed the poor—no penalty is too severe.

Yesterday we heard something on the floor of the House about protecting ourselves from those without; from those on the outside. Build a great Navy, we were told. I am for that. I have always voted for it, although I live a thousand miles from the sea. Build a great Navy, we were told, so that we would be in a position to protect ourselves. I am not afraid of anyone on the outside. My thought is what will happen on the inside if we fail to see that our citizens receive proper food and shelter.

I was at a luncheon not long ago to a distinguished former Member of this House from the Republican side of the aisle, and I heard him make a very interesting speech. He made one remark that I shall always remember. He was speaking off the record—it did not appear in the press—but I do not think he will object if I repeat it. He said: "Let me tell you something, gentlemen. You cannot expect the people of this country to wave the American flag and to sing The Star-Spangled Banner on an empty stomach"; and you cannot. We do not want any trouble within the boundaries of our own country, but we cannot have all the luxuries on one side of the street and poverty on the other and at the same time expect everyone to be peaceful and happy.

The man in the White House is trying to do something for the unfortunate people of this country who have been placed in an unfortunate position not through their own choosing, and, as I said before, I believe it is the duty of all of us to cooperate with him. If we can find any fraud, let us find it; but do not come around here throwing mud, when the gentleman himself admits that he has absolutely no evidence to present to the committee. Call a meeting of the committee! If I did, where would we start, with nothing to start on? The Government practically stepped out of the picture when the allocation was made to the States. If there has

been fraud, or if the money has not been properly used, then fault lies with the State and local officials handling the funds, not with the Civil Works Administrator.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes; always to my friend from New York.

Mr. SNELL. I do not know anything about this controversy, and I am not a party to it, but I did have something to do with establishing the Committee on Expenditures. If there ever was a time when I think there is an obligation on that committee, it is now, and for this reason: Three quarters of the expenditures being made are not under the control of the Committee on Appropriations, nor are they considered by that committee. I think the gentleman and his committee have an opportunity and duty to keep track of it. I am not throwing any mud at anybody. I simply believe that now is the time when the obligation which rests upon the gentleman's committee should be fulfilled, to keep track of these expenditures to as great an extent as possible. Just get the facts, regardless of anything else. For instance, I should like to have the gentleman give me the information of how much the C.W.A. has spent up to the present time in every State in the Union, just for information.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman should know that Mr. Hopkins—I never met the gentleman but once in my life—

Mr. SNELL. I never did either.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Hopkins issues a monthly report and tells you how much money he puts into every State in the Union. He tells you everything that is done by the Civil Works Administration. What more could you ask?

Mr. SNELL. I have never happened to see it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. As I understand the situation, when the allocation is made to a State, it is left to the honesty of the State officials to disburse the money. Mr. Hopkins has issued regulations which limit the spending of this money. They are very broad, but he keeps the States within the limits of the regulations, and tells you all in his report.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is true, but I did not know that they issued that. I shall call for it today.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. They issue it every month. One came to my office yesterday. In fact, it was delivered to the office of every Member. I have never asked for it, because it is sent to me as it is to you.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are just getting the November 30 report, 2 months late.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Probably that is due to the congestion in the Government Printing Office. The report might have been down there a month ago. Then again that might not be the cause. This is no little undertaking, and reports must be had from the States before the monthly report is issued. That seems reasonable.

Mr. SNELL. Considering the number of billions that are being spent by outside sources, independent commissions that do not come under the control of the Committee on Appropriations, does not the gentleman think his committee should meet?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The committee is going to meet, but as we all know, the President is going to ask for more money; and when that request comes along in a few days, then the Appropriation Committee will get an accounting and all the information it desires.

Mr. SNELL. That is all I ask. I think the gentleman's committee should look it over.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Wait a moment. The committee is going to meet, but the gentleman knows as well as I do that a great many of the functions of that committee were taken from it when we passed the Economy Act.

Mr. SNELL. I know that certain ones were taken away, but the general overlooking of these expenditures is still left with the gentleman's committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I realize that. The gentleman can depend upon the committee to do its duty.

Mr. SNELL. That is all I ask. I have nothing special in mind.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is the Committee on Expenditures expected to go from department to department and ascertain the amount of money that is spent and what it is spent for? That is what we have the General Accounting Office for, and recent developments certainly disclose that General McCarl is on the job. He has hundreds of employees looking after these appropriations, and but recently added many more employees so he could check up on the P.W.A. and C.W.A. expenditures.

Mr. SNELL. I think there is an obligation on the gentleman's committee to look after these expenditures. That is all.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I spent the entire summer here. As the Members of the House know, I am here every day. To this hour, I have not had one complaint showing the illegal expenditure of any of the emergency funds. Show me where this money has not been properly handled by Government officials, and see how busy the committee will get. I might further add, up to this hour I have received no evidence that any State or local official has been guilty of fraud in handling this money.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Having tried to interpret my views for me, in spite of the fact that I have voted and will vote for further expenditures, I should like to ask the gentleman if he favors giving more funds of the C.W.A. to wealthy towns and communities that do not have a dollar of indebtedness and have a low tax rate and do not need the money?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will favor voting such expenditures as the President of the United States asks for, and I am willing to leave it in his discretion as to how he is going to help the unemployed. As to the wealthy municipalities and towns in the gentleman's district or any other district the responsibility rests with them not me. They are as much entitled to ask for their share of the money as any other town if they desire to do so.

In conclusion I should like to ask the gentleman once more if he has any information at all that will be of value to the Committee on Expenditures if that committee should hold a meeting?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have a lot of complaints.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Oh, complaints! Anonymous letters.

Mr. GIFFORD. No; letters that would be satisfactory to the chairman, I am sure.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will appreciate it if the gentleman will let me see them. Mr. Chairman, no one is going to place me in the position of refusing to conduct a proper investigation. Of course, we know that other than to give the unemployed work it is not necessary to carry on some of the C.W.A. program. It is a move to help the unemployed, a move to take the citizen off charity; that we do not deny. In normal times an official would be placed in jail for carrying on some of these projects, but these are not normal times. Everyone seems to realize what the purpose of the C.W.A. is but the gentleman from Massachusetts. To make my position clear to all, I will plead with the President not to curtail the C.W.A. until at least next June. I fear the result if we do not go on with this program. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following, which was received from the Federal Civil Works Administration:

FEDERAL CIVIL WORKS ADMINISTRATION,
1734 NEW YORK AVENUE,
Washington, January 23, 1934.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
304 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In response to your telephone request of this afternoon, I am sending you herewith a list of advances from C.W.A. funds made to the States through January 20; a description of the types of projects being carried on by State and local

authorities; a list of projects being carried on under the supervision of Federal bureaus, together with an explanation of the method of administering them.

We trust that this is the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE MCCLURE,

Secretary Federal Civil Works Administration.

Total C.W.A. advances made through Jan. 20, 1934

Alabama	\$6,555,000
Arizona	1,878,000
Arkansas	5,660,000
California	17,212,000
Colorado	2,513,000
Connecticut	3,538,000
Delaware	395,000
District of Columbia	1,950,000
Florida	8,500,000
Georgia	8,053,000
Idaho	2,305,000
Illinois	21,652,000
Indiana	11,322,000
Iowa	6,673,000
Kansas	6,450,000
Kentucky	5,892,000
Louisiana	7,425,000
Maine	1,970,000
Maryland	3,447,000
Massachusetts	9,477,000
Michigan	14,050,000
Minnesota	8,665,000
Mississippi	3,683,000
Missouri	8,865,000
Montana	2,735,000
Nebraska	2,700,000
Nevada	635,000
New Hampshire	1,370,000
New Jersey	9,385,000
New Mexico	1,208,000
New York	30,470,000
North Carolina	5,190,000
North Dakota	1,798,000
Ohio	26,340,000
Oklahoma	7,310,000
Oregon	2,670,000
Pennsylvania	19,635,000
Rhode Island	1,780,000
South Carolina	5,060,000
South Dakota	4,338,000
Tennessee	6,576,000
Texas	16,458,000
Utah	2,607,000
Vermont	1,145,000
Virginia	5,053,000
Washington	7,268,000
West Virginia	6,160,000
Wisconsin	18,560,000
Wyoming	1,198,000

Total..... 357,279,000

FEDERAL CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS

In order to put 4,000,000 men to work in 1 month on public projects that were economically and socially desirable, it was necessary to make use of all available facilities.

It was thought that the State organizations using the powers and assistance of city, county, and State governments would be able in the time allotted to assign not more than 3,500,000 people. Some procedure other than relying upon State and local Civil Works administrations needed to be evolved in order to put the remaining 500,000 men to work in the several States in the time allotted. Accordingly, it was decided to administer this part of the employment program from the Washington office of the Civil Works Administration.

The President had already asked the Federal departments to give their utmost cooperation to the Civil Works Administration. While the Civil Works Administration had knowledge of a few projects, such as improvements to the public health and the control of pest mosquitos which it desired to carry out, it immediately asked the various departments to appoint liaison officers who acquainted the bureau chiefs with the problems and relayed their suggestions for desirable work to the Federal-project department of the Civil Works Administration.

The response of the departments was excellent and resulted in the presentation of a large number of suggested undertakings. Whenever one seemed to be desirable it was explored in some detail. If it still appeared feasible it was approved. Once a given undertaking was approved as a project, a request was made to some Federal department to be responsible for its administration throughout the States.

The attempt was made to secure this cooperation from the Federal department which it might be reasonably supposed would normally have undertaken the work had the appropriation been made directly by Congress in the ordinary course of events. An example will illustrate this point. It was agreed that it was desirable to reduce considerably, if not eradicate entirely, the disease

of malaria which is prevalent in the Southern States. To this end the Bureau of the Public Health Service was called into consultation and asked to submit estimates regarding the number of men and the cost for other than labor expenses that would be required to make a creditable attempt at malaria control on a Nation-wide basis. The estimates were approved and the Public Health Service was asked to assume administrative responsibility for the project. It employed 30,000 men in hundreds of separate localities in 14 different States.

In putting this program into effect, no money was actually given to the Federal Departments except a small amount to cover supervisory personnel and travel expenses. The projects were put in operation by sending an order to each State Civil Works Administration to furnish to an accredited representative of the Federal Department, the number of men agreed upon at the rates of pay prescribed and to honor suitable vouchers for other than labor expenses in the authorized amount.

The designation "Federal Civil Works project" indicates primarily a distinction of administration, because the work actually is done locally with local people. Some work that is undertaken is of such a nature that to be useful at all it should be coordinated throughout the several States in which it is being carried on. An example of this kind of project is the one for reducing the acid content of the water of certain tributaries to the Ohio River. Unless all the States bordering upon these waterways took the same precautions, it would be futile for any of them to do so. The project is being carried on by the Public Health Service co-operating with the United States Bureau of Mines and the several State health and mining departments concerned.

Since all of the work done under Civil Works must be done on public property, it was thought advisable to have some improvement work done on Federal Government property as well as on the property of State and local governments. Accordingly general improvement work which would not otherwise have been done was undertaken; for example, at the experiment stations in several of the bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, at Army and Navy posts and stations, and at Government fish hatcheries. Some of the independent offices and establishments have been aided in carrying out their work. In this category would fall the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Subsistence Homesteads Division, and the special Soil Erosion Service.

Approximately 90 projects of this kind are under way at thousands of work locations throughout the various States.

TYPES OF PROJECTS

In the following the types of projects which can be carried on by State and local Civil Works administrations are described. The general rules governing the choice of projects are indicated and lists are given, classified by types which are indicative of what is being done. They are, however, by no means exhaustive.

By far the largest part of the projects are those originated by local subdivisions. It is intended that the Civil Works projects shall fall in a field that lies between normal governmental expenditure on the one hand and the type of construction ordinarily carried forward by the Public Works Administration on the other. They are projects that can be operated on force account, can be picked up quickly and completed with rapidity. The time limit set on all projects was February 15. This made these requirements of force account, flexibility, and early completion that have had most to do with the determination of the types of projects carried forward.

At a meeting of the special board of public works on November 14, it was decided that certain projects not feasible for prosecution by the Public Works Administration be referred to the newly created Civil Works Administration. These projects are returned to the States and an application is made in the usual manner for their initiation as Civil Works projects. A great number of them which might not otherwise have been developed are being prosecuted through use of Civil Works workers.

It is required that they all be of social and economic utility and that they all have permanent value. Many of them are the sort of project that serves a community need, but that the community might find difficulty in bonding itself to provide. A classified list of projects in operation will more clearly than anything else indicate the scope of Civil Works activities.

The projects are classified as follows:

- A. Streets, roads, and highways.
- B. Schools and universities.
- C. Parks and playgrounds.
- D. Public buildings and equipment.
- E. Improvement to public lands.
- F. Pest control.
- G. Sanitation.
- H. Waterways and water supply.
- I. Utilities.
- J. Administrative, professional, and clerical.

Classification A—Streets, roads, and highways

Civil Works projects are a means of carrying on necessary road work which could not be carried out under the regular budget of the State or municipality or is not provided for by the Bureau of Public Roads or the Public Works Administration. This type of project is more than just a means of providing work and all efforts are being directed toward producing constructive results in this field.

1. Roadways:

- (a) Reclaiming public lands for highway purposes and clearing right-of-way, brush cutting, etc.

- (b) Grading, filling, leveling, widening, straightening, shoulder-ing.

- (c) Paving, resurfacing.
- (d) Improving intersections, banking, and eliminating dangerous curves.

- (e) Concrete and masonry constructions—bridges and under-passes.

- (f) Building and repairing ditches, culverts, retaining walls, and curbs.

2. Sidewalks, pathways, and parkways:

- (a) Building, repairing, and relaying.

- (b) Grading and filling.

3. Landscaping:

- (a) Constructing and painting guard rails and fences.

- (b) Planting trees and shrubbery, trimming same.

4. Traffic:

- (a) Painting and installing traffic signals.

- (b) Painting and installing street signs.

- (c) Building and marking parking spaces, traffic circles, safety signs, etc.

5. Materials for roadways:

- (a) Concrete, macadam, sand, gravel, and rock, also cinders and asphalt.

- (b) Quarrying, hauling, excavating, digging, and dredging.

Classification B—Schools and universities

Due to overcrowded conditions and general lack of funds on the part of the various local boards of education, there is a great field for worthwhile projects in this category. Projects so classed include work not only on the actual school buildings but also all work done on the ground and equipment belonging to them.

1. Buildings.

- (a) Small construction jobs that can be finished in required time.

- (b) Repairing, painting, and reroofing.

- (c) Plastering, plumbing, and lighting.

- (d) Furniture and fixtures renovated.

2. Grounds and equipment.

- (a) Building and improving athletic fields and grandstands.

- (b) Resurfacing tennis courts.

- (c) Improving dressing rooms and field houses.

- (d) Constructing and repairing swimming pools and hockey rinks.

- (e) Grading and beautifying school grounds.

- (f) Laying walks and paths.

Classification C—Parks and playgrounds

This includes all types of work on the grounds and provides an excellent field for good projects.

1. Improvement of grounds.

- (a) Clearing, grading, filling, and brush removal.

- (b) Roadways, walks, bridle paths, and streams.

- (c) Drainage, gutters, and sewers.

- (d) Landscaping, fences, railings, and signs.

- (e) Lighting and traffic-signal system.

2. Recreational facilities.

- (a) Swimming pools, bathing beaches, wading pools, and bath-houses.

- (b) Golf courses, handball and tennis courts.

- (c) Playgrounds, athletic fields, and skating rinks.

- (d) Picnic grounds, shelters, band stands, outdoor theaters, tool houses, field houses, and camp sites.

Classification D—Public buildings and equipment

A great deal of extraordinary work in the repair and maintenance of public institutions has been instigated through civil-works projects. This includes work on airports, armories, bridges, city halls, community houses, courthouses, docks, fire houses, garages, hospitals, homes for aged and indigent, libraries, lodging houses, markets, museums, orphanages, police stations, jails, repair shops, sanitariums, schools, stables, storehouses, toolhouses, workshops.

Equipment includes tractors, graders, ditchers, concrete mixers, trucks, asphalt mixers, steam rollers, sprinklers, small tools, fire hydrants, police signals and fire boxes, etc.

1. Construction and repairing:

- (a) Foundations, concrete.

- (b) Roofing.

- (c) Plumbing and lighting.

- (d) Plastering, papering, painting.

- (e) Demolition of old buildings.

2. Equipment:

- (a) Painting.

- (b) Servicing.

Classification E—Improvement to public lands

This classification offers a broad field for a great variety of projects of real value in communities of all sizes and locations and covers a multitude of subjects, such as: Airports, cemeteries, dumps, marsh lands, fair grounds, golf courses, natural amphitheaters, State- or community-owned farms, fish hatcheries and experimental stations, national forests, swimming pools, beaches, and community subsistence gardens, as well as the land around public buildings.

The establishment of community centers may also be included as a unit by itself, being made up of clubhouses, week-end camp buildings, athletic and camping facilities, recreation halls, playgrounds, development of bathing and boating facilities, and agricultural demonstration plots.

1. Improvements:
 - (a) Grading, leveling, filling.
 - (b) Repairing, painting buildings and fences, digging wells, and building dams on State-owned farms.
 - (c) Landscaping and lighting.
2. Forests:
 - (a) Building and improving trails, trail signs, and fire warnings.
 - (b) Removing brush and dead trees; erosion control.
 - (c) Establishing camp sites.
 - (d) Improving water system and reducing fire hazard.
 - (e) Forest pathology (tree surgery).

Classification F—Pest control

To provide the proper direction for pest-control projects, the Civil Works Division has obtained the cooperation of the following Federal Departments:

Department of Agriculture—Biological Survey, Agricultural Engineering and Economics, Plant Industry, Plant Quarantine, and Animal Industry.

Treasury Department—Public Health Service.

In some cases this work may be carried out under the direction of corresponding State or local departments. Local Civil Works authorities have called on such local departments as may be able to advise upon the initiation and/or undertake the direction of projects of this nature. State agricultural colleges and experimental stations have been especially helpful in pointing out specific local pests to be combated, as well as in supervising projects.

1. Insect control:
 - (a) Mosquitoes (malaria control), drainage, oiling, steam clearing.
 - (b) Grasshopper eradication; poisoning.
 - (c) Tick eradication, dipping, poisoning, quarantine.
 - (d) Japanese beetle control; poisoning, quarantine.
 - (e) Moth control and others.
2. Rodent control:
 - (a) Rat eradication; poisoning, trapping, laboratory control work.
 - (b) Prairie dog and gopher eradication.
 - (c) Others.
3. Animal disease control:
 - (a) Inoculation and quarantine (livestock).
 - (b) Predatory animals; poisoning and trapping.
4. Plant control:
 - (a) Eradication of ragweed, poison ivy, other poisonous weeds, flowers.

Classification G—Sanitation

Wherever possible, sanitary operations should be of a community-wide nature. Communities may make a Civil Works project of a survey of their sanitary conditions to determine their adequacy before starting projects. (See classification J—Administrative, professional, and clerical.)

1. Excavation and drainage:
 - (a) Sanitary and storm sewers, manholes, catch basins.
 - (b) Ditching, cleaning creek beds, filling.
2. Construction:
 - (a) Sewage disposal and incinerator plants, sewer outlets.
 - (b) Sanitary privies, septic tanks, filter extensions, cisterns.
3. Repairing and painting:
 - (a) Sanitary plants.
 - (b) Trucks, wagons, and equipment.

Classification H—Waterways and water supply

Projects of this nature are advisable where the labor cost is the major factor in the total cost of the project. This is especially true in the improvement of reservoirs, watersheds, and the manual labor involved in the laying of water mains.

1. Waterways:
 - (a) Rivers, canals, lakes, streams.
 - (b) Widening, straightening, deepening, damming, dikes, and levees (building, repairing, and cleaning).
2. Watersheds and reservoirs:
 - (a) Clearing, filling, cutting fire lanes.
 - (b) Planting, landscaping, riprapping.
 - (c) Development of flood control and irrigation districts, soil erosion.
3. Waterworks:
 - (a) Filter plants, chlorination plants, aeration plants (building and repair).
 - (b) Pumping stations, walls, auxiliary systems.
 - (c) Landscaping grounds.
4. Distributing system:
 - (a) Laying and repairing water mains.
 - (b) Erecting and inspection of hydrants.
 - (c) Erecting, repairing, and painting pressure tanks.

Classification I—Utilities

1. Street-car lines.
2. Maintenance of equipment, removal of old tracks.
3. Gas Works.
 - (a) Installation and repair of mains and equipment.
4. Electric light, power, and heating plants.
 - (a) Installation and care of fire alarms and police boxes.
 - (b) Conduits and electric cables.
 - (c) Roadways and bridge lighting.

Classification J—Administrative, professional, and clerical

The possible projects under this classification are so numerous that only an outline can be included here. The variety of re-

searches and surveys which can be undertaken by Civil Works divisions are almost limitless.

Some examples of actual projects undertaken under this head are as follows:

a. Personnel in various local C.W.A. administrative offices; clerks and machine operators in Weather Bureau stations; surveying and relocating boundary lines; plotting streets; drafting charts, maps, and diagrams; revising legal codes in cities and towns. Other work utilizing white-collar workers with a technical training, artists, architects, engineers, translators, etc.

b. Extra clerical and accounting help in public offices; repairing and indexing books, maps, photographs, paintings; filing, transcribing, and copying old records; all projects calling for research or statistical surveys are supervised by the Federal Civil Works Administration to prevent duplication.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER].

Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, being one of the newer and younger Members of this Congress, it does not behoove me to join in this affray with the powers that be. I do not want you to understand that I am so conceited that I think I can stand here and debate against those men. It just happens that I had asked for a little time to discuss a matter and call the attention of this House to a matter which has just been discussed. It so happens that I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures that has just come under fire. I wish to say, as a member of that committee, that I have implicit faith in the chairman of that committee and I am willing to abide by him and his judgment in regard to the actions of that committee.

One of the criticisms that was directed at Congress in the last campaign was the fact that during the last 4 years there was too much committee work and not enough action on the floor of this House.

I rose for the purpose of calling the attention of Congress to a very serious situation that is facing many millions of people in this country. That has to do with the discontinuance of the C.W.A. I received a letter last week from the secretary of the Federal Civil Works Administration, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert that letter in my remarks, together with a copy of the telegram referred to in the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The letter and telegram are as follows:

FEDERAL CIVIL WORKS ADMINISTRATION,
1734 NEW YORK AVENUE,
Washington, January 19, 1934.

The Honorable RANDOLPH CARPENTER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARPENTER: We are in receipt of your kind letter of January 15, enclosing copy of the telegram from the mayor of Junction City, Kans.

The Civil Works program can be continued beyond February 15 only if an additional appropriation is made for that purpose.

You may be interested in the enclosed copy of telegram sent by Mr. Hopkins to the State administrators.

Very truly yours,

BRUCE MCCLURE,
Secretary Federal Civil Works Administration.

[Telegram]

JANUARY 18, 1934.

To all State Administrators:

Due to the fact that average weekly wages for Civil Works is in excess of original estimated weekly pay rolls it is necessary to reduce the hours worked per week on local, State, and Federal projects to keep within the money available. You are herewith instructed that effective January 19, 1934, all per-diem workers are to be put on a work week as follows: In cities over 2,500 population, maximum 24 hours per week. In cities under 2,500 and open country, a maximum of 15 hours per week. All clerical, supervisory, and professional workers, a maximum of 30 hours per week with proportionate wage adjustment. This does not include administrative workers in administrators' offices. This applies to all Civil Works and Civil Works Service employees and must be made effective everywhere on this date since disbursing officers will be instructed not to pay wages for work in excess of the hours provided herein. From this date no name shall be added to any pay roll except in actual replacement of a worker fully terminated and finally paid off. Notify all your counties by wire today of the contents of this telegram. Wire today reduction in dollars on your weekly pay roll accomplished this action. This telegram supersedes all prior instructions.

HARRY L. HOPKINS, Administrator.

Mr. CARPENTER of Kansas. Now, if we would turn these millions of men, who are now employed, out into the streets in the middle of winter, it seems to me that would be one of the greatest calamities that could happen to this country. I am opposed to turning out these millions of men, who are now being given useful employment by this Government, into the cold and into the bread lines at this time of year. It will be the very same thing as taking a hungry man in and placing him at a table to eat, with a nice big feast before him, and then, when he got about half way through, take it all away from him. You might take an exhausted man home that you had picked up cold and exhausted along the road and put him in a nice warm bed, and, in the middle of the night, come and throw him out.

We have heard a great deal of talk about war and the reason for a larger Navy. We know that we may be faced with war any morning; any day. It may come upon us with the suddenness of an automobile accident or like unexpected sickness. If we were thrown into war, we would be up here clamoring with all the patriotism we could muster to vote for \$5,000,000,000 here and \$5,000,000,000 there, and we would not blink an eye and every cent of that would be going out for destruction. The only result would be crippled and maimed soldiers which would require the Government and taxpayers of this country for years afterwards to take care of them; but here is a case where the money is spent for useful purposes, for constructive purposes, and for purposes that each community has needed for years. Every cent of money that has been spent is going to a good cause. The people of this country do not want any dole. They want to work for their money. We are not going to let people starve in this country. You have heard that time after time, and we, as citizens, do not propose to let the needy starve. Oh, it is fine to appropriate money and let the contractors take all the money, but this is the first time when Government money has gone out to the forgotten man, the little man at the bottom. Here is relief starting at the bottom and going up instead of starting at the top and going down. Of course, we should not spend any more money than we need to. We should try to balance our Budget and save our money in times when we are making it so that we will have it on hand in times of sickness and when we need it. That is the position of this country today. A nation is nothing but a cooperative society anyway, organized to help the people obtain some protection or some benefit that they could not obtain alone.

I have thought in the last few years that we were trending toward socialism in this country. I thought perhaps it would come in 50 or 75 years. I now think it will come probably a great deal sooner than that. There is only one thing that will save us from socialism in this country, and that is the success of Roosevelt and his "new deal."

I want to call the attention of the Members of this House to a letter I received from a standpat G.O.P. veteran who was wounded on the battlefield of the Argonne, who has a bullet next to his heart now because it cannot be removed, whose compensation was cut, and who is getting along during these times the best he can. Let me read you what he says about conditions in general:

There is sure some worthwhile conversation politically to tune in on these days. Now, both you and Mac know about how I stand politically. As far as the Democratic Party as a whole is concerned, I have never been able to see where it has been so hot in the past. It sure is comical to hear some of the brethren orate on the Jeffersonian principle idea. Said orator, who, if hard pressed, would be at a loss to explain. As to whether the bid for fame in that instance was based on the shinning up of Mount Shasta or the invention of a new-fangled kitchen mousetrap. All I can say at this late date is that if Thomas was guilty of some of the things that some of his political opponents accused him of, is that he was some stepper. However, at this time personally, my lack of faith in the Democratic Party is only exceeded and superseded by my entire lack of faith, trust, and confidence in the Republican Party. (May no shades of my G.O.P. ancestors be glancing over my shoulder as I type that statement.) And the dismal yelps and howls of some of the hide-bound, shell-backed, age-old Republicans in our little city are sure peaches and cream to ye scribe's ear, and would make "Me Too" White's eulogy of the Ku-Klux Klan sound like a beer-salesman's address at a German picnic in comparison.

And now eliminating both pro and anti factions from the conversation, I will give you the truth of the matter, at least in this vicinity. And that is that. I do not believe that the United States Government ever expended any large amount of money wherein a large percentage of the money expended reached the place intended or was of more material benefit. In this vicinity, Randolph, this Government work is a godsend. And believe me, the men employed sure appreciate it, and in the great majority of cases are showing that appreciation by doing a real day's work. There have been several home boys made here that have likewise been lifesavers. Just what the end will be is of course all guesswork for a fellow of my caliber. But sink or swim, win, lose, or draw, believe me, I remove my hat to President Roosevelt and this Democratic administration. They did not just sit down and say, "Now, if that isn't just too bad." Not much; they just grabbed root and commenced to growl and tug and dig. The old preamble to the Democratic platform, we view with alarm, has joined dodo bird or is being sung to the tune of "Who's afraid of the big, bad wolf," etc. And, say, that naval program, boy, oh boy, what-a-what-a building program! The best guaranty for peace in this hemisphere and the Pacific that I have seen since we scrapped our battle fleet in '21. The recognition of Soviet Russia, a master stroke of retaliatory (as regards Japan) and trade diplomacy, repealing the prohibition law, and, etc., etc. And here is where the shoe sure pinches many a Republican foot: Here is an administration that is really trying to carry out its campaign and platform pledges, and may the saints preserve us, it had to be a Democratic President and a Democratic administration! And that, Randolph, is just how the average, fair American regards this administration, regardless of what his politics may have been.

Now, I hope all of us will back the President in the recommendation I understand he is going to make to continue the C.W.A. [Applause.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, as a minority member of the Appropriations Committee and of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, I would be most uncharitable if I failed to acknowledge the utmost consideration and courtesy extended to me by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], the able and genial chairman of the subcommittee, with whom I have had the pleasure of working during the past 6 weeks. The work of conducting the hearings incident to the preparation of the Navy Department appropriation bill was carried through to its conclusion with one thought in mind, that of providing for an efficient and effective first line of defense, and I believe the bill before you today is the best that could be offered, and hope it will meet with your approval.

I am told that an amendment will be offered by the Committee on Naval Affairs which will bring our Navy up to the full treaty strength. I am in hearty accord with such an amendment, as I have always been a firm believer in maintaining a first line of defense second to none.

During the course of the hearings I was interested in learning that the Navy Department, like all other Departments, had contributed to the redemption of the Democratic pledge to reduce the regular expenses of the Government 25 percent. It had been able to keep within its reduced budget by using so-called "emergency funds" allotted to it from the funds provided by Congress under the N.R.A. to carry on projects that would ordinarily have been financed in the regular way. I have no criticism to make of this work, which has helped to provide jobs and reduce the unemployment. I believe the Naval Establishment should be maintained at the highest possible point of efficiency.

I regret that the appropriations for the activities of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves could not be larger.

I had hoped that we might give them more money this year than we were able to give them. However, they are placed on a parity with the other branches, as you will notice from this statement made by Admiral Block that it was the decision of the President that the National Guard, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Naval Reserve should have a uniform number of paid drills during the fiscal year 1935. The President himself set this number at 36. So that the 36 paid drills incorporated in the bill for 1935 are in conformity with his decision that the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps should have the same number of paid drills.

I do insist, however, that the present administration's policy of operating under a two-Budget system is ridiculous and misleading. In most instances the work and material paid for by the Navy Department out of funds allotted it

by the N.R.A. were necessary and routine projects, and would have been provided for in the regular appropriation bill had we been operating under a single-Budget system.

And here I want to place in the RECORD certain testimony in reference to the hedge clause. Examining these witnesses we found that 15 companies had bid on fuel oil. The three lowest bidders had hedged their bids about with these hedging clauses. The following information was submitted to the committee by Admiral Peoples:

Under schedule 989, opened November 17, 1933, covering delivery of fuel oil at various points on the east coast during the 3 or 6 months' period January 1 to June 30, 1934, a total of 15 bids were received. Three of these bids contained the so-called "hedge" clause. An analysis of bids showed that at many points the only bids received contained this hedge clause or that it was incorporated in the lowest bid. As it was considered that the hedge clause had been inserted because of possibility of price changes during the period the contracts would be effective, decision was reached to reject all bids and readvertise on a monthly basis.

It is interesting to know what they put in this hedging clause; and in order that the RECORD may show what it is, I insert a typical one at this point.

Subject: Restrictive provisions inserted in certain bids on fuel oil by bidders.

COLONIAL BEACON OIL CO., MEXICAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION,
STANDARD OIL CO. OF NEW JERSEY

"If the National Industrial Recovery Act, any code, regulation, or interpretation thereof, or any future governmental law, regulation, or order, or the depreciation of the currency of the United States by the reduction in the gold content of the dollar, the issue of fiat money, inflation, expansion of credit, or otherwise, shall directly or indirectly increase the cost of the seller in furnishing the products called for herein, or shall direct that such products shall be sold at minimum prices which shall be an increase over the prices provided herein, it is agreed that, upon 30 days' written notice by seller to buyer, the prices in this contract shall be revised from time to time to include such increase. Seller's statement of its increased costs and of their application in increasing prices hereunder shall be conclusive upon buyer, but buyer may cancel this contract as to any items affected by such costs at the end of such 30-day period by giving to seller at least 15 days' advance written notice thereof. However, in no event shall the revised prices be more than seller is willing to quote generally at the time of delivery on new business for the same products, quantities, territories, kinds of customers, and handling and delivery conditions as provided in this contract."

2. No awards were made under schedule 989 covering east-coast fuel-oil requirements January 1, 1934, to June 30, 1934, because of the above-quoted clauses appearing in the bids. East-coast fuel-oil needs are now being met by month-to-month purchases until firm offers for a longer period can be obtained.

3. In fact, the Comptroller General of the United States in a decision to the Secretary of the Treasury dated December 11, 1933, held that such a conditioned bid was indefinite and uncertain and not responsive to the advertised specifications, as the bid attempts to incorporate therein terms and conditions not offered by the Government to all bidders as a basis of competition. Consequently such a bid may not be accepted.

The only actual savings or reductions in expenditures in the Navy so far as the taxpayer is concerned were those brought about by reduction in the pay of personnel and the reduction in ration allowances, neither of which, in my opinion, is justified.

The uncertainty of the Government's financial policy, fear of inflation, and issuance of fiat money have made it difficult for the Navy Department to secure bids for supplies over an extended period. When bids are secured, they are frequently accompanied by a hedge clause, which would increase the bid prices by reasons of increased costs due to operation of the N.R.A. and other causes incident to so-called "recovery plans." By reason of this fact, the policy of letting contracts for 3- or 6-month periods was necessarily discontinued. Prices quoted in certain instances ranged from 40 percent to 66½ percent in excess of former prices; consequently, it was decided to make monthly purchases until conditions become more settled.

After hearing the chiefs of the various bureaus, every one of them men of ability and all of them conversant with their arm of the service and the details connected therewith, it became very evident that the economy program of the administration meant only this: a more complicated system of accounting, involving two drawing accounts with the Treasury of the United States, one of which was written in black ink, the other in red.

I do not believe it a good practice, or fair, to continue the policy of hoodwinking the taxpayers of the United States by attempting to show a balanced Budget through the means of a complicated accounting system. We all know that the national debt is increasing by leaps and bounds and will continue to do so for many months to come, as has been indicated by the President when he so frankly informed Congress that we will have a \$7,000,000,000 deficit at the close of this fiscal year. Why not face the facts and present them honestly, without subterfuge?

I cannot refrain from comparing the weeks required by this subcommittee for consideration of a routine supply bill with the remarkably short time required by this House to dispose of a bill passed last Saturday affecting the monetary gold stock and monetary system of the United States.

In the consideration of the Navy supply bill we had access to the experience of men identified with the Navy for years, together with the recorded history of former committee hearings, and yet, despite these enlightening helps, more than 6 weeks on almost daily hearings were required to perfect the bill.

Now, in the case of House bill 6976—a measure that proposes to make drastic changes in the Nation's monetary system and to place the sum of \$2,000,000,000 at the disposal of the Secretary of the Treasury, with practically no restrictions on what he shall do with that vast sum of money—considerably less than 1 week was required by the committee in charge for its consideration. In fact, I doubt much if the committee crossed a "t" or dotted an "i" in the bill.

The Navy appropriation bill which you have before you stands on its own feet. It is not bolstered up by weeks of propaganda.

The so-called "gold bill", giving unprecedented and exceedingly dangerous powers to an official who is only a political appointee—one who has been rewarded for his political activities rather than one who is in office by reason of the votes of the electorate—was passed with little consideration, because it embodied the much-propagandized impounding of gold and devaluation of the dollar. I personally am quite willing to impound the gold and to revalue the gold dollar, but I could not by my vote grant the Secretary of the Treasury or any other individual the right to play with \$2,000,000,000 belonging to the United States. Father Coughlin, who is recognized as a monetary expert by the administration, one of very few men called as a witness before the committee, in his radio address January 20, 1934, said:

Our Constitution proclaims that Congress and Congress alone has the right to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

He also said:

The will of the American people is that Congress shall retain that right by keeping the control of gold and by regulating its value from time to time when necessary, not abdicating this right into the hands of an appointed Secretary over whom they have little control.

He also criticized the internationalization of our gold. I have always believed that, as far as possible, we should keep our own gold in the United States and out of the hands of the international bankers.

I trust that this bill as passed by the House will be shorn of its autocratic powers and tempered with justice and safety at the other end of the Capitol.

I respect and admire the fearless and tireless manner in which the President has labored unceasingly since his inauguration to bring about national recovery. His has been a difficult task. I dare say no man in the United States has worked harder than he to accomplish his purpose.

Mr. Chairman, like the majority of men in the House I am past the half-century mark in life. I was blessed with a mother and a father who were typical of the sort of God-fearing people who make up the backbone of this great Nation. No man is infallible—that word can only be used in conjunction with the name of the Great Architect of the Universe. It is an insult to the intelligence of every Member of this House to say that we must accept the mandates of any individual citizen, regardless of his position, be it high

or low, without the right of comment or criticism. I have pledged allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and shall do what I believe is right for my country, regardless of the demands of any individual, party, or group of individuals. When the time comes that Congress adopts the policy of being a rubber-stamp, then representative government ceases to exist in these United States. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Dockweiler].

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I hope what I say will be heard over at the White House and in the Navy Department.

Yesterday when CARL VINSON, Chairman of the Naval Committee, had finished his address on the subject of a great Navy, I asked him the question what his attitude would be, and his committee's attitude, on the removal of the fleet from Pacific waters to Atlantic waters at this particular time. He said he would not be willing to express his own opinion or the opinion of his committee on the subject, because that was a matter of Executive determination.

As a member of the Pacific-coast congressional delegation, I stand before you and protest the removal of the Pacific Fleet, which is our entire fleet, both the battle force and the scouting force, from Pacific waters to Atlantic waters. You will ask me what my reasons are. I am not raising the hue and cry of war. I am the last man in this House or in this country that will vote for war other than a war of defense; but, gentlemen, conditions are bad on the Pacific coast and in international affairs so far as the Far East is concerned. Would it not be far better to bring this fleet around to the Atlantic coast for maneuvers, not this spring, but the next spring or the following spring? These things can be done in years to come when times are not so ticklish in international affairs.

What do we find our condition to be today? We have not settled the Philippine situation by a long shot in this House or in the Senate or with the Philippine Legislature. This matter is now pending, and it is a serious situation. The Philippine Islands are populated by more than half Japanese. We have just recently witnessed the spectacle of the Japanese Government retiring from the League of Nations, and yet they have retained their mandated islands that were given to them while they were members of the League of Nations. We do not know whether the Japanese have put defenses upon those islands situated in Pacific waters. The Japanese will protest that they are a peaceful people. I admire the Japanese for what they have accomplished in the last 50 years. It was an American admiral that opened the Japanese Nation to the world, and they have done great things since that time. The Japanese have diplomatically protested the location of our fleet in the Pacific waters.

This fleet is not in my congressional district, even though I do represent many miles of the Pacific coast. This is not in my congressional district, and I do not speak from the standpoint of commercial advantage by reason of keeping the fleet in Pacific waters; but I tell you, gentlemen, that the Japanese protest the appearance of the fleet there, and they have apparently convinced the State Department and the Navy Department that in order to alleviate the critical feeling in Japan, which has been built up through newspaper publicity and propaganda in Japan, that our fleet should be brought around through the Panama Canal to the east coast at this time. But this is all a misnomer, so far as the Japanese Government is concerned, because their nation is completely censored. Nothing can be published in any newspaper in Japan unless it is properly censored by the proper Government officials. Consequently if there are articles being published in newspapers on the subject of the maintenance of our fleet in Pacific waters, that talk is generated by the propaganda bureau of Japan in order to keep the Junker party, the militaristic and naval party, in power in Japan. Is this the time to remove our fleet when this party is in control? The Japanese people are a people who desire peace, but these people are being controlled at the present

moment by the wrong sort of leaders—by executives who have built up machinery for war.

I remember when Woodrow Wilson declared war upon the Central Powers, he drew the distinction that he was not declaring war upon the German people, because they were a good people, but he was declaring war upon the German Government, the government that had brought about a situation that had caused the war, and he said he would stamp out that kind of government and return to the German people a popular government.

The Japanese have disregarded the nonaggression Kellogg Pact. The Minister of the Japanese Government, Mr. Hirota, has just addressed their Parliament, the full text of which speech is in the morning papers, and in which he obliquely complains of the Russian attitude toward themselves. We have recently recognized Russia. This apparently has been offensive to Japan. All of these things are occurring at this present moment and very recent history.

I tell you, gentlemen, this is no time—and I speak for peace—to remove the Pacific Fleet to the Atlantic waters. This is no time to remove the fleet through that little bottle neck, the Panama Canal, and into the expanses of the Atlantic waters.

There is another thing to be remembered. In my State there are over 100,000 Japanese, half of whom are native born and supposed to be citizens of this country under our rule of law, but under the imperial rule of Japan these people are still citizens of His Imperial Majesty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWICK. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes.

Mr. SWICK. Has the gentleman taken into consideration the cost of transferring the Navy from the Pacific to the Atlantic?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Yes. I have tried to get that figure, but I have not been able to get it so far. It will be quite expensive to remove the fleet from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

Mr. SWICK. I can give it to the gentleman. According to the best figures available now, it would cost approximately \$4,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I want to say to the gentleman that I am not very much of an admirer of the administration, but I do not believe that the Navy Department will at any time permit the removal of the fleet from any place where it is needed for the defense of the United States.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. In answer to the gentleman's question, I am not the kind of citizen who insists upon the keeping of the fleet in any particular locality just because it will produce commercial profit for that particular place. I believe every one of us in this Congress, as well as every other citizen, should rely upon the judgment of the Navy Department and the heads of that Department when they make any of these moves that apparently have some bearing upon the efficiency of the Navy or the Army. But, Mr. Chairman, I am fearful that Washington does not understand the real undercurrent on the Pacific coast. For this reason I have risen to make these remarks.

We have a situation in California, as I commenced to say, of over 100,000 Japanese. Their citizenship is quite dubious, as I have explained. Under the imperial rule they are still subjects of His Imperial Majesty across the Pacific waters, and yet we construe those who are native born as citizens of our own Government. Now, what kind of patriotism can we expect this to produce from such persons?

Also there is a distinct, diplomatic movement right now in my State and with the State Department here to relieve the Japanese and the Chinese of the embargo on immigration that is against them. They want to be placed under a quota, and I have this morning signed a letter to the President which, as I recall, was also signed by practically every one of the 21 Members of Congress from the State

of California, protesting the relaxation of the present statutory condition so as to permit any Japanese or any Chinese to come into the State of California or into this country, even under a quota system.

Of course, the Japanese say this is offensive to their natives, and that at home their local writers write this up and picture themselves as being discriminated against. Of course, Mr. Chairman, in California we have to discriminate against them. If they come in under any conditions, they cannot intermarry under our laws. If they come in under any conditions, they cannot expect social equality so far as our State is concerned. They cannot be assimilated as citizens under our laws. Consequently, is it not better for them that they do not come into our State, whether they are Chinese or Japanese?

Mr. Chairman, this is the position of California and myself, particularly, because I am a native son of that great State. I started 20 years ago to fight the encroachment of Orientals into my State. We have fought the fight and successfully, and we have prevented further encroachment by immigration of Chinese or Japanese into our State. Now, Mr. Chairman, they will come to Congress and ask for a modification of these immigration laws.

I warn you that the Japanese are going into the next conference in London in 1936, and they are going to ask for one thing. They are going to ask for the elimination of the aircraft carrier and the naval aircraft division between navies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. KAHN].

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania say that an amendment is going to be introduced to bring our Navy up to treaty strength. It is just about time that we did something in this direction.

I need hardly tell the House how strongly all my life I have been in favor of national defense. When I say I am in favor of a strong national defense I do not mean in any sense that I am in favor of war. I abhor war in every way, shape, and manner. I feel our only protection against war is in an adequate national defense.

I hold in my hand now a copy of the San Francisco Examiner, which is running a series of war pictures, previously censored, that to my mind are the most potent argument in favor of national defense. These pictures are a timely reminder of what an inadequate national defense does, and are most opportune, lest we forget the price we paid for unpreparedness. Let us not err that way again.

Certainly, with unemployment a major problem, the stimulation given to industry by this program will be a real stimulation, not a false one. It will be a permanent stimulation, not a temporary one, putting men back to work at their own jobs in almost a hundred related industries.

I trust in the next fiscal year to see all appropriations for national defense in every branch increased, rather than decreased, for our own protection and for our prestige. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WEIDEMAN.]

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I fully agree with the sentiments expressed by the lady from California, who has just taken her seat, concerning her attitude on war. There is no glory in war. I am going to vote for this naval bill and for any other proper naval or Army bill that comes before this House. [Applause.] I will do that because we can have no peace unless we have an adequate defense. Let profits of war be conscripted. I hope when the bill is presented to this House to conscript the profits made out of war in the future it will receive approval, because, if it is necessary to conscript human lives in the conduct of a war, it is all the more necessary that no one be allowed to make any money or a profit out of war. If we do this we will not have so many advocating war.

If the theory of war is correct, a necessary defensive war should make patriots, and not war millionaires. Let us properly take care of the human wreckage cast upon our shores as a result of our last war for democracy before we allow ourselves to be drawn into another slaughter.

Now, I want to bring to the attention of the House a most vital matter—not a matter of potential destruction but a measure of construction. That is the continuation of the Civil Works Administration. I believe that a bill will be brought in asking the House to continue the C.W.A. until May 1. I think that is the only or chief remedy that has helped the depressed cities of the country and it should be extended beyond May 1 if necessary. I realize that there may be a difference between the rural communities and the urban as to their viewpoint of the C.W.A. For instance, spring is coming along. I understand from men representing the rural districts that the farmers are having difficulty in getting labor due to the fact that the wages by the Government in C.W.A. work is in excess of what the farmer pays his farm hands in some sections of the country. This will make it difficult for him to get sufficient help to work his farm. For this reason I believe the Administrator of this law should cooperate with both sections of the United States and of the various States and that when the quotas of the various States are reduced the reductions should be made from the rural sections. The reason for this is that the farms can take up the excess labor sooner than the industrial areas, due to the busy season on the farms being in the spring and summer. The quotas should be continued in the cities until industry is further established to again take up and absorb the unemployed.

I think, however, that is a matter of administration. I want to call the Administrator's attention to the future allocation of funds, that there should be some discrimination used in allocating this fund—that the cities should be favored.

If you will help in the reestablishment of our industrial centers we will be in a better position to pay a higher price for your farm commodities. There is no purchasing power in pauperism. The morale of the entire country is being restored rapidly by allowing men the chance to work and earn an honest living for their families. It is much nobler to give a man a pay check so he can buy in an open market than to give him unwillingly a welfare check for a few groceries.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEIDEMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that larger sums could be better used to provide more and better highways?

Mr. WEIDEMAN. I agree with the gentleman. There is no reason why the funds could not be used for highways—for more and better highways. I would be in favor of a liberal allowance for materials so men could be put to work and improve our national highways and to build new highways. I am in favor of building highways to enable the people to travel from one end of the country to the other in Detroit-built automobiles, the finest produced in any country of the world.

Now, I have not asked for one penny for my district from the P.W.A. I am one of those who believe that we should not make a grab at public funds every time the pork barrel is passed around. I should like more money for materials to enable us to build roads that all the people of the Nation can enjoy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert a telegram that I have received from the city clerk of Detroit and a letter from William Cohen, C.W.A. administrator for the city of Hamtramck.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Now, I want to read this telegram:

DETROIT, MICH., January 22, 1934.

CARL M. WEIDEMAN,

United States Representative, House Office Building.

It is impossible for Detroit to proceed in a businesslike way with C.W.A. projects because of the suspension of funds for materials.

We urge your assistance in promptly securing such legislation as will make funds available for carrying on all present projects and further commitments. We appreciate your cooperation of the past.

RICHARD W. READING, *City Clerk.*

HIGHLAND PARK, MICH., January 15, 1934.

HON. CARL WEIDEMAN,

Care House of Representatives:

Would be serious to stop C.W.A. Do all in your power to continue same. Morale of the people would be ruined.

R. RAY MARKLAND,

Mayor Highland Park, Mich.

HAMTRAMCK, MICH., January 19, 1934.

HON. CARL M. WEIDEMAN,

House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I take this opportunity of calling your attention to the absolute necessity of Congress making adequate provision for the continuance of the C.W.A. program in Michigan.

As director of the C.W.A. in the city of Hamtramck I have personal knowledge of the tremendous benefit to this community as a result of the C.W.A. work.

Our Hamtramck C.W.A. employees receive approximately \$34,000 weekly, all of which is spent for the necessities of life which have been so long denied them.

All of the projects upon which the C.W.A. workers are employed are of a permanent and lasting nature and are projects which were necessary for the welfare and benefit of the community at large. Most of the projects consist of work which has long been delayed by the administration, due to lack of funds.

At a recent meeting of the Hamtramck retail merchants it was unanimously agreed that their business has increased considerably, due to the additional sales made possible by the money spent by C.W.A. employees.

Approximately 1,800 residents of the city of Hamtramck are now employed on Hamtramck C.W.A. projects. At least 1,100 of these were formerly receiving dole from the welfare department. Said employees are no longer dependent on charity but are earning their own living, and an attitude of optimism toward the future has almost completely dispersed the dark clouds of pessimism which formerly prevailed.

It is the consensus of opinion that the C.W.A. program has shown tangible beneficial results and is one of the most, if not the most, helpful measures yet adopted by the United States Government in combating this depression.

On behalf of the city of Hamtramck, its residents, citizens, and business men, and those who have finally found their independence through employment on C.W.A. projects, I urge you, as our Representative, to assist with all the power at your command in passing the necessary legislation to continue the C.W.A. program.

Thanking you, I remain,

Very truly yours,

WM. COHEN,

Hamtramck Director, C.W.A.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] said that none of this money should be given to cities that have no tax burden. Up to this time I have failed to read of any notice from anybody in Massachusetts saying that they do not want this C.W.A. money. They are still taking it. As far as Detroit is concerned, we are getting on our feet. The automobile industry is picking up. I talked yesterday with a representative of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. He said that their factory, making automobile glass, is working to capacity to fill the orders for the automobile plants. But notwithstanding that, we are not yet on our feet. The few thousand men thrown out of employment by the curtailment of the C.W.A. last week were thrown on the welfare relief roll. I think you should give us more time to rehabilitate ourselves, and I think you should appropriate some more money for the C.W.A. work, even after May 1, until we can get our industry started again. We are willing to bear with the gentlemen from the agricultural districts. I think the Representatives from the cities went along with you, hook, line, and sinker, all the way. We will do so in the future. We want to help you, and we will go the full limit for you. In addition, we are asking you when this bill comes up to go along with us, and I think it should be brought to the attention of the administration that the farmer should not be handicapped by putting too much of C.W.A. labor in rural districts in competition with this farm labor. The farm and the factory must recover from this depression together. We have a mutual problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H.R. 7199, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

REFINANCING OF FARM DEBTS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 6670 to provide for the establishment of a corporation to aid in the refinancing of farm debts, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 6670, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Senate amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after "That" down to and including "charter" in line 5, and insert "there is hereby established."

Page 1, line 7, after "The", insert "principal office of the corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia and the management of the corporation shall be vested in a."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "of such corporation shall consist" and insert "consisting."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "the" and insert "of the Farm Credit Administration, hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Governor', and the."

Page 1, line 10, strike out all after "Commissioner" down to and including "cause" on page 2, line 10.

Page 2, line 17, after "bylaws", insert "rules, regulations."

Page 2, lines 17 and 18, strike out "to the charter of the corporation" and insert "thereto."

Page 2, line 19, after "corporation", insert "authorized under this act."

Page 2, line 23, after "compensation", insert "and duties."

Page 2, line 25, after "corporation", insert "by this act, to require bonds of them and fix the penalties thereof and dismiss them at pleasure."

Page 3, line 2, strike out all after "paid," down to and including "amended", in line 7, and insert "but the rate of compensation of such agents, officers, and employees of the corporation shall be subject to the limitation contained in section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed as an agent, officer, or employee of the corporation under this act at a salary of \$4,000 or more per annum except with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Page 3, line 13, after "powers", insert "as may be."

Page 3, line 15, strike out all after "this" down to and including "thereto", in line 17, and insert "act."

Page 4, lines 8 and 9, strike out "and made available to the governor" and insert "to the corporation."

Page 4, line 11, after "issue" insert "and have outstanding at any one time."

Page 4, line 11, after "an", insert "aggregate."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "in the aggregate."

Page 4, lines 12 and 13, strike out "at any one time outstanding."

Page 4, line 20, strike out "States," and insert "States."

Page 4, line 21, after "and", insert "such bonds."

Page 4, lines 21 and 22, strike out "on account of such guaranty."

Page 6, line 4, strike out "a" and insert "any."

Page 6, line 4, strike out all after "bank" down to and including "amended," in line 6.

Page 6, line 7, strike out "value;" and insert "value issued under the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended."

Page 6, line 7, after "exchange", insert "such."

Page 6, line 11, strike out all after "cash," down to and including "amended," in line 13, and insert "such consolidated farm-loan bonds."

Page 6, line 14, strike out "price" and insert "prices."

Page 6, line 15, strike out "and."

Page 6, line 17, after "bonds", insert "and to invest its funds in mortgage loans made under section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended."

Page 7, lines 9 and 10, strike out "but this provision shall not apply to the issuance of any bond to refinance" and insert "except for the purpose of refinancing."

Page 7, lines 15 and 15, strike out "or under section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933."

Page 7, lines 17 and 18, strike out "or the Land Bank Commissioner, as the case may be."

Page 8, lines 22 and 23, strike out "Upon issuance of the charter of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the" and insert "Until February 1, 1936, the."

Page 8, line 25, strike out all after "of" down to and including "bonds" on page 9, line 4, and insert "the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation either in cash or in bonds of the corporation at his election. Not to exceed \$600,000,000 of the bonds and proceeds thereof."

Page 9, lines 6 and 7, strike out "but the face value of bonds which may be issued for such purposes shall not exceed \$600,000,000" and insert "in addition to the amounts transferred to such corporation under section 3 of such act."

Page 11, line 4, after "Governor", insert ", with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury."

Page 11, line 16, after "is", insert "further."

Page 12, strike out all after line 10 down to and including line 21, and insert:

"SEC. 16 (a). The first sentence of the eighth paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting before the semicolon after the words 'section 13 (a) of this act' a comma and the following: 'or by the deposit or pledge of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds issued under the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act.'"

"(b) Paragraph (b) of section 14 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 12, secs. 353-358), is further amended by inserting after the words 'bonds and notes of the United States' a comma and the following: 'bonds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation having maturities from date of purchase of not exceeding 6 months.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, Mr. DOXEY, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. KINZER.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7199, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, being connected with the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, I am in a position to appreciate the pressure being exerted on the Federal Government by the States, by subdivisions of the States, and by the people to take over a larger and larger share of governmental responsibility and just now of enforcing the criminal laws of this country. I believe every student of the situation, regardless of his politics, will not fail to be apprehensive as to the probable effect upon the governmental capacity of the people of the Federal Government doing for the people so many things during this emergency which the people, through their State governments and their smaller units of government and as individuals have formerly done for themselves. I believe it will be agreed that there is a law of nature, universal in its application, under which power to do things is lost by the people who cease to do them. That law is stated most generally, I believe, that nature will not waste her energy. I believe we all appreciate the necessity—I think I do—of the Federal Government doing now most of the extraordinary things that are now being done by it dealing with the economic situation of this country; but the doing of those things by the Federal Government tends to have the people for whom those things are done want their Government to do many other things. This economic program, justified by necessity, creates for them a mental attitude of dependence, a lack of self-reliance, a lack of courage, a lack of determination to take care of their own affairs. In the presence of a situation like that it seems to me the clear duty of public officials and Members of Congress, of everybody, to hold to the people of the State all of the governmental responsibility which they have the governmental capacity to discharge. It must be evident to every student of the present situation that when we come to abandon, as we shall, the present method of doing things, it is going to require people of a great deal of governmental

capacity to take up and carry on where the Federal Government is going to have to leave off, and to take care of the governmental responsibilities of the people.

WHAT IT IS ALL ABOUT

I believe, too, that every student of what it is all about—this living on this earth for a brief time—must agree that what it is all about is evidently nature's effort to develop people. Certainly it is Nature's plan to develop people by forcing people to do things that are difficult. For these reasons I am anxious, having concern for the future governmental capacity of the people, that the people shall not shift the enforcement of the criminal law to the Federal Government, and that the agents of the Federal Government shall not reach out and take those responsibilities from the people. It is not the mere matter of sending somebody to the penitentiary or of hanging somebody or who or what agency of government shall do it that is involved. The question is shall we leave to the people something to do that will enable that people to develop their capacity to govern against the day when they are going to have to tackle the biggest job the people of any country ever tackled. That is just plain, ordinary, common horse sense. It is largely through the governmental agencies of the States, which function largely through officers chosen directly by the people in the political subdivisions, such as counties and cities, that State governments operate. Everybody who has any sense knows that we cannot continue to run this Government and its economic and political machinery by somebody in Washington telling everybody what to do and letting them have a part of their own money back in order to induce them to do it. There is a vast difference between a governmental arrangement where public officials are selected to effectuate the public will and a governmental arrangement where appointed officials substitute theirs for the public will and effectuate that substituted will through bureaucratic organizations. The latter, we may concede, tends for the moment toward a more efficient government, but at so great a draft upon the governmental capacity of the people as to warn of its danger and of the necessity to abandon it as soon as the emergency is ended.

EFFICIENCY OF GOVERNMENT DEPENDS UPON THE GOVERNMENTAL CAPACITY OF ITS CITIZENS

Since the efficiency of government such as ours is dependent upon the governmental capacity of its citizens, it is my contention that while acting through concentrated governmental power in order more effectually to deal with a great emergency, the destructive tendencies of such arrangement should be counteracted as far as possible by leaving with the people of the States the doing of all governmental things within their power which are not necessary to be done by the Federal Government in order effectively to deal with the emergency.

Now, I have called attention to a community that I have been studying. I had something to say about it the other day. I have been watching with great interest the city of Chicago undertaking to deal with its problem. Chicago attracted national attention a few years ago by reason of the fact that it was gangster-ridden and apparently gangster-controlled. Every person who has been to Chicago lately, who has watched the signs of the times there, and who is familiar with the situation at all, knows that those people have grown tired of being bossed by a lot of gangsters. What made them grow tired of it? It was the gangster who made them grow tired of it. The Federal Government might have gone after these racketeers, but it is my contention, not my contention merely, it is a fact, that the Federal Government would thereby have robbed the people of Chicago, and robbed itself of the chance to have the type of citizen in Chicago which their fight against these criminals is developing. The getting rid of these gangsters is not important, but the struggle of the people, the development of the people in getting rid of the gangster is the important thing. The strength which they get, the consciousness of responsibility, the strength of an aroused civic decency, is the important thing; and the depredations and tyranny of the

gangster apparently were the only things that could give it to them.

Cities may be a little slower than the appointed agents of the Federal Government. Great results do not come quickly. It takes a good while to bring about great results. The regeneration of the people of a great city is a great result. That is another one of nature's notions about how it does things. We may not like it, but there is nothing we can do about it. When we see people beginning to be stimulated, aroused, making an effort, I do not care if it is a feeble effort, if it is in the right direction for an agency of a supergovernment to come in and let those people sit down and relax where they were, is an act against the best interests of this country.

On yesterday I had called to my attention an editorial published in one of the Chicago papers. It made reference to some observations which I have recently made concerning the effort of Chicago to rid itself of the gangsters. It is a short editorial. It is one that is constructive and helpful to all, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to insert the editorial.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I refer to Chicago because it is our outstanding example familiar to the people of all the country.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Saturday, Jan. 20, 1934]

CHICAGO AS A NATIONAL EXEMPLAR

If the ears of Chicago burned yesterday, they had unusual occasion. A friendly voice from another State was raised in commendation of the city's morale in fighting crime. It was a reversal of experience and therefore the more gratifying. But no false modesty can induce a good Chicagoan to say the praise was unmerited. Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Dallas, Tex., a lawyer and for years a public prosecutor, made the floor of the House of Representatives a rostrum for depicting Chicago as an example of self-reliance and effective energy in dealing with the racketeers and other criminal denizens of its underworld.

Mr. SUMNERS, who is Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, formed his laudatory impressions of Chicago and its citizenship last summer while participating in that committee's investigation of local crime conditions. His timely point, driven home and illuminated by reference to Chicago, is that danger lies in the increasing dependence of American citizenship upon Federal aid even in local affairs. He sees the probable development of a flabby and resourceless spirit in States and municipalities if the tendency to shift burdens to remote shoulders is not checked, if there is not a revival of courage and self-confidence on the part of local governments. He is by no means alone in that disturbing appraisal of current trends.

Against that fear he sets as encouragement and inspiration the story of Chicago's awakening. Chicago, he asserts, affords the most magnificent demonstration to be found on the continent of the ability of its people to govern themselves.

Some may take exception to that sweeping tribute and discount its unmeasured terms as Texan eloquence. It is qualified by Mr. SUMNERS' statement that Chicago yet has much to do. Every Chicagoan knows the truth of that, and if the Texan's praise is fully to be justified that truth must be borne constantly in mind. There is no question, however, that the civic morale is higher today than it has been for years. The arrogance has gone out of the underworld. Its tail is between its legs.

Coincidentally with Mr. SUMNERS' congratulatory words President Frank J. Loesch, of the Chicago Crime Commission, declared at the commission's annual meeting that the last year had been notable for the vigorous warfare waged on organized crime by local authorities. Criminals have been driven to desperation by police and public prosecutors. The city is riding the lawless elements by which it once was ridden. National recognition of its fight against crime should stimulate Chicago to maintain that fight and also its fight against political corruption, against franchise fraud. Acclaimed as exemplar of self-reliant courage, Chicago must not fail to live up to that role.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman give the name of the newspaper?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is the Chicago Daily News.

Now, in order that I may not detain the House any longer than necessary, I am going to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and then I am going to read a speech that I made last fall before the Flag Association of the United States when they were discussing the suppression

of crime, and I discussed the "Responsibility of the people for the suppression of crime."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

THE PEOPLE ARE THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I discussed the responsibility of the people for the suppression of crime. I do not like to be continually discussing this subject, but it happens to come to me and other members of the Committee on the Judiciary as it probably does not come to the rest of you gentlemen.

There may be crooked officials who make copartnership with hijackers, and kidnapers, and racketeers, and murderers, but these officials have been selected by the people. That more or less intangible thing spoken of as the "government" cannot select public officials. It cannot tell them what to do. It cannot discharge them for breach of faith. It cannot sit on juries. It cannot convict criminals. It cannot create the necessary public opinion. Such a government does not exist aside from the people who possess all its powers, operate its machinery, formulate its will, and create the public opinion and public purpose which is its supreme law and dynamic force. It has no agencies except the people through which to correct any condition. The people possess all the power there is, and therefore fundamentally and basically all the responsibility there is.

The only government we have is myself and you, my neighbors and your neighbors, just we, the people. Every failure of such a government is my failure and your failure, the failure of the people. There is nothing more absurd than the favorite indoor sport of the American people, "cussing" the Government.

We got started wrong insofar as the suppression of crime is concerned, and rather naturally so. Many of our ancestors were fugitives from governmental oppression. In the effort to protect the individual against the crimes of the State, we have so weakened the State by legislation, by judicial construction, and by the attitude of public opinion and public sympathy that money and organization give to crime a large element of immunity from punishment.

There is much truth in the saying that technicalities which used to make justice in spite of law, with us make law in spite of justice.

With us, the proper presumption of innocence and burden of proof have been distorted beyond all rational proportions. Revolting against the old custom of torturing defendants to force confessions, we have not only secured the defendant from being put to any involuntary examination, but we have gone so far that even under circumstances where every social duty imposes the obligation to make an explanation, and every impulse of an honest person would be to explain any reference in argument or otherwise to the failure of the defendant to avail himself of the privilege and natural duty to testify, is held to be reversible error.

In many of the States now in the trial of criminals supplied with plenty of money, the trial judge, instead of having the necessary power to control the trial, sits in a reserved seat refereeing a battle between lawyers, witnessing a judicial farce.

Whose business is all this? It is the people's business. It is their responsibility. Of course, there is the responsibility of leaders, but the people choose their leaders. There can be no leaders without followers.

There can be no decent governmental conditions among a people who permit newspapers to come into their homes which place before their children as men of courage and as heroes these dirty rats, lost to every sense of true courage and civic obligation, who, by political corruption, machine guns, and cowardly assassination make the lives and homes and property of supposed-to-be-free American citizens insecure. There can be no decent governmental conditions while these supposed-to-be-free American citizens are afraid to testify as witnesses, shirk their obligations as jurors. There is one other thing, the people must put into their proper place these murderer and hijacker aid societies,

these old sisters and sisterettes who, whenever a jury has had the courage to rid society of one of these people who has forfeited his right to live, begin bedeviling the Executive to undo the work of a courageous jury.

The time has come when as a responsible, self-governing people, we must begin intelligently taking care of the business of a self-governing people.

It is perfectly evident that we have been getting away from the "I and we" notion of government, and shifting to the "they and it" notion of government, and as we have done so we have been moving further and further toward the condition at which we have arrived.

WHAT PRICE JAZZ

We could not be bothered. We had all got young. Instead of pointing the youth of the country to persons of stable, sound judgment, meeting the serious responsibilities of life, youth became the ideal. Everybody got a horn. On with the jazz; getting a little gasoline to go somewhere, to leave there to go somewhere else, in such a hurry to see some distant mountain that we did not have time to look at the mountain we were passing.

We have refused to heed the admonition of sound-thinking, serious students of public problems, and have yielded the public forum to those who would bite a dog anywhere in order to make the front page of the public press.

There is no mystery why organized crime walks the streets of our great cities unafraid. We have refused to make our contribution to the formation of an advised, conscious of responsibility, intelligent public opinion, which is the only safe guide for government among a free people. We have applied in its stead in no small measure the theories of some persons who evidently got overheated in the process of education; too much temperature, too many college degrees, too many theories, too much fermentation, and too little of the sunshine of common sense in their curing. They are supposed to have been doing our thinking for us. As a matter of fact, much of what they have paraded, as the result of their original thinking, are schemes and theories which they have dragged from the junk heap of discarded failures.

If perfection and the absence of criminal inclination are the normal state of man, such theories as that these enemies of society ought to be sent to hospitals instead of punished, would not be so absurd. But we all have criminal inclinations. People cannot live together on this earth if the aid to self-control of a reasonable certainty of punishment for crime is withdrawn.

Confucius was evidently a man who walked about the world with his eyes open. He said that knowledge without thought is labor lost. These people have been losing a lot of labor. He said also that thought without knowledge is dangerous.

PEOPLE ARE BEGINNING TO THINK AGAIN

These are dangerous times. We are trying to think now.

Our faces are turned toward higher ground. Of course, we are still willing to escape our difficulties, to pass them on to somebody else, but we are beginning to realize, however, that we will not be able to do so. There is nobody else.

We will not be able to turn over the suppression of crime to public officers while we take a vacation from civic duties. We are under the lash of necessity. This task which we are going to have to put our shoulders to is not going to be such a bad thing for us. This sort of thing which we are going to have to do is as essential to the development of a great people as is the necessity to struggle in order to break through an opposing football team essential to the development of a great football team. The great epochs in the world's history are those, and only those, when the people, with a high purpose and a will that would not yield, have fought their way through great difficulties to the consummation of great victories. We have the chance, the challenge, the necessity to make this the greatest age of all time.

May I follow through with this football illustration? Great football teams are not made great by weak opposition. Neither are they made great by having the captain do all the playing. Just as the youth learns how to play football

by playing it, people learn to govern by governing, how to suppress crime by suppressing it, by working at the job themselves. It is the universal law of life. Nowhere, except in government, is there failure to recognize this fact, and it is in the realm of government that this age is registering its colossal failure. Governments are not accidents. They are governed by natural laws which people must respect. We may be able to go places faster than our ancestors went, but we are not following their example when we beg to shift the responsibility of local domestic government and personal responsibilities to a great Federal bureaucracy, and when we cower in the face of an organized, superimposed government of criminals.

It is not in the development of government or of any other such thing per se that nature is concerned. It is in the development of people that nature is concerned. That is what it is all about, this living on this earth for a brief space of time. Whatever operates against the development of people operates against the plan of nature, and in violation of the laws of nature which have been provided to make certain the cooperation of human beings in carrying out nature's plan. Human beings who refuse to cooperate must pay the penalty. We are paying it—this scourge of crime.

DIFFICULTIES, THEIR PLACE IN THE SCHEME OF THINGS

It is for this development of people that such difficulties as suppressing crime are provided. Difficulties are nature's gymnastic paraphernalia provided for the development of people. These difficulties in government are a part of that equipment. Government could have been made a fool-proof, self-perpetuating thing. Everything could have been made all right, but we would have been as a field of cabbages. No great character ever came out from the Tropics, where he had only to climb a tree for his breakfast, and pull off a few leaves on the way down to make himself a full-dress suit.

The right of the States to govern was never important, but the necessity of the States to govern always was important and always will be important, because they are the agencies of government in which the private citizen has the greater power and the greater responsibility.

The best way to study a big question is to reduce it to such dimensions as to bring it as an entity within the scope of human comprehension. These general problems of law enforcement and the effect upon individuals and communities of the presence or absence of the sense of responsibility of the people have come several times under my personal observation. I am not discussing theories; I am discussing what I have seen.

I was prosecuting attorney of Dallas County when we were completing the task of emerging from wild-west conditions. A condition obtained in one of the best village sections of the county which was highly unsatisfactory to many of the people there, but they did not want to come out into the open in their opposition. Some of them were merchants. They were afraid of the hurt to their business. As far as they would go at first was to tell me in confidence of conditions and ask for their correction. They wanted somebody else to clean up their local condition. In that state of public attitude nothing effective could be done about it. I watched the evolution of that people through the several stages from that in which they would not do right because it would probably cost them money and might involve some personal danger to them, from a feeling of dependence and helplessness to that when those same persons were standing up courageously in open meeting putting themselves and their money to the task. Persons developed into leaders who never knew before they had that ability. There developed during that struggle a community solidarity, a consciousness of responsibility, and a militant decency. With the accomplishment, which was easy then, came a sense of community power, of courage, and of self-respect, which through all the intervening years has been their glory and their salvation.

Several years ago this community was visited by a terrible cyclone. Many of its people were killed and many more wounded, with corresponding property loss. I heard of it very early next morning. It was my old home. I was preparing to go out with a relief expedition from Dallas. Be-

fore we could get away a committee came in from the stricken community and told us that they appreciated what we were proposing to do, but that they had taken care of the situation. In an hour and a half after the storm the citizens had taken care of their dead, got their wounded to the hospitals, estimated their damages, taken stock of their resources, and without any pose, with ability and resolution, set about the work of relief and reconstruction.

I have recently been to Chicago. There was a great fair in progress, but there was something greater than the fair going on in Chicago, which had for me too strong a competition in interest for me to spend more than an afternoon at the fair. The people of Chicago, under the lash of necessity—when I speak of the people of Chicago I mean the individual citizens of Chicago—with a new-born courage are awakening into action, into consciousness of responsibility, and are feeling the thrill of power. They are beginning to demonstrate the capacity of that people for self-government. How long their difficulties, their necessities, this task of the criminal shall be required to break the lethargy of that people and make them to be the type of citizens which the general necessities of Chicago require, no one can forejudge. But they are moving in the right direction.

It is not the war on gangsters which is important; it is not the ridding of that community of gangsters which is important. The gangsters, under the circumstances, are the best asset Chicago has. They are the nasty tasting dose of medicine which a sick community had to have. These gangsters are not the disease; they are the evidence of the disease and of nature's effort to cure it. They have not happened accidentally. There is no result without an antecedent adequate cause. That cause lies deep. If that community had been civically healthy, these rats could not have lived in their midst.

The great thing is not getting rid of these gangsters but getting rid of that something in the attitude, in the purpose, in the courage of these people which made these gangsters possible. The development of decent attitudes among the people, the development of leaders among those who never knew before they had the capacity to lead, in a sentence it is the redemption of the people of Chicago resulting from the inescapable necessity to struggle to free themselves from the power of these criminals which is the thing of importance.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COULD HAVE ROBBED CHICAGO OF ITS CHANCE

That is why I opposed the Federal Government going into Chicago and robbing that people of the supreme opportunity to develop themselves, and to demonstrate their ability to win a great victory, and in that winning redeem themselves and stand forth as a great people, to stand forth for all time as a great testimonial to the capacity of Anglo-Saxon people to govern themselves.

Of course, Chicago is not going to get rid of these criminals permanently any more than a farmer cultivating his fields, ridding them of the weeds which would choke out his crops, gets rid of all the weeds for all time. It is the weeds and the hazards and difficulties in raising crops which makes good farmers, just as the hazards of a golf course makes a good golfer. No farmer need have fear that he will ever get his fields so clean and in such perfect condition that he will deteriorate as a farmer because there is nothing to do. Nature takes care of that in the fields of corn, and in the fields of government.

I suppose a grown man could carry the football for his young son through the line to the goal better than the boy could do it, and if the big thing was getting the ball to the goal that would be the sensible thing to do, but the thing of importance is the physical and mental development which nature gives to the young boy as a reward for his struggle to place the ball behind the enemy's goal line.

Even if it were conceded that the Federal Government, or any other agency, could suppress crime, which it cannot, and take care of all the other things which are of concern to the people, and thereby relieve the people of the necessity to do it, that would no more prove it a good thing to do

than would the fact that the father could be more effective in placing the ball behind the goal line prove that he ought to do it while his young son sat on the side line and watched.

I have no apology to offer for continuing to use this illustration because the laws of nature are the same everywhere and are universal in their application. The thing, however, which makes this football illustration inapt in an important particular is that there is with us in the suppression of crime, fundamentally considered, no father and not even an Uncle Sam, in the sense that we have fictionized that bewhiskered caricature. We have no king. We have no hereditary nobility, no ruler by divine right. Our Government is not an "it"; it is not a "they." There is no government other than ourselves—myself and you—the people. Whenever we take a vacation from the discharge of our duty to govern we pay the price in corruption, in inefficiency, in the hijackers, kidnapers, in the reign and rule of crime of every sort.

We have been taking a vacation in this country. That is what is the matter with us. Not until the last few months has it been possible to bring to public consideration anything which burdened thinking and required the serious consideration of serious matters. There are a number of indications that we are at the end of the vacation.

In order that I may not be misunderstood, I want to say that I realize that, by reason of certain surrenders to the Federal organization when the States came into the Union and that the States maintain no border patrol, there are certain Federal responsibilities, but most of these can be cared for by compacts among the States without necessitating a duplication of State and Federal police personnel, and without going any further than we have gone toward converting our Federal courts into police courts adjudicating matters of internal police control.

But I want to warn you now that, unless the people set their faces against it, the time is not far distant when the Federal Government will be stepping in, and as a result the States and the communities and the private citizens will be stepping out, not in the same degree, perhaps, but in the same way as occurred with regard to prohibition. It is not only in government that this may be observed but it is everywhere in life. Divide responsibility between the greater and the lesser and the lesser loses his share by surrender or by usurpation.

ONLY BY GOVERNING CAN CAPACITY TO GOVERN BE PRESERVED

There is no way under heaven or among men by which the capacity of a people to govern can be preserved and developed except by governing. There is no way to have the people in their private lives and in their homes before their children stand forth as an influence in behalf of things which are the antithesis of crime and cowardice and in favor of good and efficient citizenship except for them to be an actual, courageous force in the suppression of crime in their community. In this we see the practical philosophy of preserving the power of local government and the responsibility of the private citizen. It is that responsibility which is the great developer of good citizenship and of governmental capacity, which is the only foundation strong enough to bear the weight of a great governmental superstructure such as we have.

We might burn our Constitution and tear down our capitol, but if we preserve the governmental capacity of our people they would build again. But if the capacity of the private citizen to govern is lost through its nonuse, the Constitution dies, and our capitol becomes monuments of our failure. This we know, nature will not give greater power where the power possessed is not used. It will not waste its energies. The fish in the Mammoth Cave have no eyes. Tie your arm by your side and it withers. The active, determined, courageous discharge of the obvious duty of the private citizens, who, in fact, are this Government, is not only necessary in order that the shameful reign of crime shall end in this country, but it is necessary because of its effect upon these private citizens and upon their capacity to preserve the governmental institutions of a free people. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. The gentleman referred to the Chicago gangster a moment ago. Is not the crime condition throughout our Nation, particularly in Chicago, due to the judiciary more than anything else? How does the gentleman account for the fact that in the city of Chicago, where they have approximately 3,000,000 people, they have around 65 or 70 criminal court judges, while in the city of Milwaukee, where they have almost 1,000,000 people, we only have one criminal court judge, and we have the model city of the United States as far as crime is concerned?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Let us assume that Milwaukee is the model city. I have heard many good reports about it. But I want to answer the gentleman's question. When we get right down to the bottom of it, the responsibility is not the judges, because the judges do not get their own jobs by their own volition. The judges are either appointed by somebody whom the people elect, or the people elect those judges. I know it is not the right way to court public applause. The right way to do it is to abuse somebody else and tell the people they are all 100 percent right and somebody else is wrong, but that does not get us anywhere. Only an aroused, determined private citizenry can do it. In a sense, the Government is the agent of the people, but in just as definite a sense, the people are the agents and instruments of the Government. Governments are provided for in nature just the same as human beings are. People have to have government. That shows it is provided for in the scheme of things. Let me illustrate; I have to go to the farm for my illustrations. I do not see how you town-raised people ever did get any real information. Suppose I ride by somebody's farm, and I do not like the way that farm is being conducted. It is rundown; the crops are not being properly cultivated. I am the one who hired the people who work that farm, I am the one who tells the people who work that farm what they must do and what they may not, and I am the only one who can discharge them. Would it lie within my mouth to go around criticizing the owner of the farm because the thing was not done right? I know we get a lot of satisfaction cussing the Government, but we, the people, employ the persons who operate the Government.

ONLY A PEOPLE CAPABLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT CAN DEFEND THEIR LIBERTY

And we, the people alone, can tell them what to do. We alone are the people who can discharge them. If there is anything being done wrong in the operation of the Government fundamentally, we, the people, are to blame and not that intangible thing which people love or ought to love with that holy love called patriotism. Only a people possessed of power and conscious of responsibility can guard that government and perpetuate its institutions. A people bottle-fed and rocked to sleep by the hand of a great Federal bureaucracy cannot do it. Neither can the great Federal bureaucracy do it. The plan of God in nature is made sure of final execution as well by the limitations placed upon human capacity as by the capacity given to human beings.

I see where we are drifting and I do not like it. I do not want to see the people of this country turning over to the Federal Government the protection of the lives and property of the people of this country. I want to see the people of this country retain all of the governmental responsibility which they can discharge because only such a people can keep a country free. I have no pet theories about this matter. Only a deep concern for the happiness and security of my people and of my country prompts me to speak. When a people weaken from lack of exercise, of their governmental muscles, if I may use that expression, then they are easy marks and become the prey of any scoundrel who gets into public office or into positions of economic power. But when you have got a strong people, conscious of governmental responsibility, growing stronger and more capable all the while through the discharge of that responsibility, if we are not the right people in Congress, they take us out and put the right people here. They do the same thing in other

positions of public importance and power. But I do not care what else you have. If we permit the great body of American citizenship to lose their governmental power by its nonuse, I do not care who your statesmen are, what their capacity is, I do not care how eloquent they are. I do not care what may be the wisdom of the man who holds public office, this country cannot preserve its institutions—no people can preserve their liberty who lose the strength to defend it. We have no kings; we have no hereditary nobility. In this country we have nobody to govern except the people. There is not anything more destructive than this notion abroad in this land—on to Washington for everything the people may want! This creation of an attitude of national dependence upon a great Federal bureaucracy is one of the most dangerous things that a free people can do. I am supporting this recovery program, but I am not unmindful of the price we will have to pay for having got ourselves in a condition which makes this program necessary, and I am not unmindful of the high type of citizenship which will be necessary to deal with its aftermath if we are to avoid disaster. [Applause.]

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am prompted to put an inquiry to the gentleman from Texas because I recognize in him—and I am sure he will take this in good part—the type which has been somewhat submerged recently—the Jeffersonian Democrat. I might like to count myself in if a Jeffersonian Democrat stands for the principles which the gentleman from Texas has just enunciated.

The gentleman from Texas has touched upon an issue which I believe is the most vital and fundamental to be confronted by our people for many a year; and I am wondering what comment or thought may come from the gentleman from Texas when he recalls, in connection with the centralization of power at Washington and the atrophying of the power of self-government which may be inflicted upon the people as its result, that the President of the United States in his annual message to the Congress delivered before this House but a few days ago, openly indicated that this whole new program embarked upon incident to the emergency shall become the permanent policy of the United States.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I shall answer the gentleman very candidly my own opinion about it.

Here is what I think about these times, and what I say about this is not said in a controversial way, if I am able to diagnose this particular period in which we are—it is the recurrence of a very interesting phenomenon to be found not infrequently in the governmental history of Anglo-Saxon peoples; crises come in the history of all peoples. Frequently they result from the failure of the people to do what they could have done safely when they ought to have done it. Anyway they get themselves up against a crisis that exceeds the capacity of ordinary Anglo-Saxon governmental machinery functioning as it ordinarily functions with distributed responsibility and a slow pick-up, because our governmental system has a slow pick-up and it has a distributed governmental responsibility.

Ours is a very old system of government. Through long processes of time certain governmental instincts seem to develop.

Our people seem instinctively to sense the existence of a crisis which exceeds that capacity of their governmental system functioning in the ordinary way. In such a situation instead of permanently changing their system of government they have the genius to concentrate governmental power, give to the agency into which the concentration has gone all the power that a dictator could have, which carries with it as quick a pick-up as a dictatorial government could have, but at the same time they are able to retain the power—I am talking about power now—retain the power over the exercise of the delegated power, and retain the power to recapture and redistribute this concentrated power

when the crisis shall have ended. What will happen in the future only time can tell, but I do not believe we will permanently operate under the present arrangement. As I see it, the present arrangement is the offspring of a great crisis and must disappear with the going of that out of which it grew. Doubtless we will salvage something, possibly much, out of this experience, but it is not a governmental revolution. It is not new in Anglo-Saxon governmental experience. There is a fairly well defined course which is run. Anyway we had better begin to get ready for a parallel swing back toward the other extreme from that toward which we have been moving. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time—5 minutes—to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would not at this time refer to the pending election contest from Louisiana if it had not been that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] took the matter up yesterday.

On the first day of the present session of this Congress, the Committee on Elections No. 3 was instructed by a resolution unanimously approved by this body to determine the prima facie question and the ultimate right and privilege of Mrs. Bolivar E. Kemp and J. Y. Sanders, Jr., to a seat in the House of Representatives.

This resolution was introduced for the sole reason that the issues involved effect the rights and privileges not only of the citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of Louisiana and the State of Louisiana but also of every congressional district and every State in the Union.

This is not based upon the operation of political factions, but because vital and important legal questions are involved.

I deeply regret that conditions have arisen making this action necessary and imperative. I infer from the speech delivered on yesterday by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] that his conclusion is that the committee in its report has not correctly construed the law, and that the decision unanimously reached is not sustained by the Constitution and laws of the United States or of the State of Louisiana. In that connection, I differ with the gentleman from Mississippi, and I confine my statement to an outline of the law, as I see it.

The issues now before the House relate to an election to fill a vacancy in the office of a Representative in Congress. Now what does the Constitution and laws provide in connection therewith.

Section 2 of article I reads:

When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

Section 4 of article I reads:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Now it has been unanimously held that where a State has enacted legislation as directed by the Constitution the laws of the State govern and control the election procedure.

The Hoge case has been cited in support of the action of the Governor of Louisiana in calling an election to be held in 7 days to avoid the opportunity given by the laws of Louisiana to select their nominees in a primary election. What are the facts?

The actual decision has the opposite effect and supports the conclusions rendered by Elections Committee No. 3 of the present Congress.

The John Hoge case (Pennsylvania):

It appears to the committee that, though by the second section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States it is made the duty of the executive authority of the respective States to issue writs of election to fill vacancies, yet, by the fourth section of the said article, it is made the duty of the legislature

of each State to prescribe the times, places, and manner of holding such elections. It appears, however, that several elections to supply vacancies in Congress have been held heretofore in Pennsylvania; yet, on examining the laws of that State, it appears that no law exists prescribing the times, places, and manner of holding elections to supply such vacancies as may happen in the representation in Congress.

The State of Louisiana had enacted laws prescribing the time, place, and manner of holding elections to supply vacancies in the representation in the Congress.

The inference is that the only reason why the Committee on Elections at that time and the House of Representatives upheld the executive order of the Governor of Pennsylvania was that there was no law in Pennsylvania fixing the time, manner, and place of holding elections.

Mr. MONTET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. MONTET. In the Pennsylvania case did it appear that the people of the State have been imploring the Governor to call an election for 3 months before he did it?

Mr. WILSON. I am not sure about that.

Mr. MONTET. It is true in the Louisiana case, is it not?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; that is true; they had appealed for the calling of the election.

Mr. MONTET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. MONTET. Is it not also true that in the case pending before us now, the Kemp-Sanders case, despite the impropriations made on the Governor by the people of the Sixth Congressional District for months and months, that 3 days before the Governor actually issued the call for the Kemp election he made a public statement on the 24th day of November that he would not call an election?

Mr. WILSON. I do not know whether that is in the record or not, but it would not matter so far as the legality of this question is concerned.

Mr. MONTET. Is that not a fact?

Mr. WILSON. Is that in the hearings?

Mr. MONTET. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I must confess that under ordinary circumstances I would be inclined to look with extreme disfavor upon a precedent which refused to accept the apparently bona fide credentials of the Governor and secretary of state showing that a person was entitled to a seat in this House; but if I understand the facts in this case, that contention was waived by the agreement of both parties to this contest; is that not true?

Mr. WILSON. That is correct. It was to go to the committee for a report upon the legality of the election and whether or not either party should be seated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as this record is made up, Mrs. Kemp in this case waived, as I understand it, by agreement, her right to insist upon being immediately sworn in as a Member under her credentials.

Mr. WILSON. That is what I understood from my colleague, Mr. FERNANDEZ, who spoke on that subject.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman support the committee report?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. I have but a short time, and what I want to do is to get into the Record my construction of the law.

Mr. COX. Very well. I will not detain you.

Mr. WILSON. It comes now to the fact that the sole contention, as I understand it in this case, is whether or not the Congress of the United States will uphold the order of the Governor of Louisiana as being legal when he called this election to be held within 7 days, after the 6 months had elapsed, since the vacancy occurred.

THE GENERAL ELECTION LAW OF LOUISIANA

Now, what are the provisions of the law of the State of Louisiana in this case? It says:

That it shall be the duty of the Governor, at least 30 days before every general election, to issue his proclamation giving notice thereof, which shall be published in the official journal.

The board of supervisors of election of each parish shall give 15 days' notice of every general election by advertisement in the official journal of every parish, if there be one, and by posting at four public places in the parish if there be no official journal in said parish. But no default by the Governor or parish board of supervisors of election to issue said proclamation shall deprive the people of their right to hold an election as fixed by law or vitiate said election when held.

SECTION 6. Be it further enacted, etc., in case of vacancy in said office of Representative in Congress between the general election, it shall be the duty of the Governor by proclamation to cause an election to be held according to law to fill such vacancy. Elections shall be held in the precincts and at the polling places hereinafter defined and hereinbelow directed to be established.

It shall be held according to the laws of the State of Louisiana. That is the direct declaration to us.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In what respect did the election in which Mrs. Kemp was supposed to have been elected fail to follow the State law?

Mr. WILSON. That is what I am getting to now. In the State of Louisiana, as probably in every other southern State, the primary election is the election. That is the controlling factor. Of course, there is no opposition after the primary election is over.

LOUISIANA PRIMARY ELECTION LAW

Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana, That all political parties shall make all nominations for candidates for the United States Senate, Members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, all State, district, parochial, and ward officers, members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, and all city and ward officers in all cities containing more than 5,000 population, by direct primary elections.

That is the mandatory provision of the Louisiana law.

That any nomination of any person for any of the aforesaid mentioned offices by any other method shall be illegal, and the secretary of state is prohibited from placing on the official ballot the name of any person as a candidate for any political party not nominated in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. How did the action of the committee, giving Mrs. Kemp the nomination, affect the right of any other elector of the district to offer for the office in the general election?

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman from Georgia knows that the nomination at a Democratic primary under the emblem of the Democratic Party, which is the rooster in Louisiana, is equal to election, and to tell someone outside after this ticket is prepared that anybody may go in and write his name on it is useless.

Mr. COX. I am not antagonistic to the position the gentleman has taken, but as Mrs. Kemp had no such nomination, how did the fact that two committeemen came together and offered her the nomination deprive any other citizen of the district of the right to participate in that election?

Mr. WILSON. Because this nomination prohibited any other name going on the ticket as the candidate of the Democratic Party.

Mr. COX. But that is a part of the machinery down there. How could the action of that committee be construed as a nomination that would operate against anyone else participating in the election?

Mr. WILSON. Because the tickets were printed with that name only.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The only way any candidate could have his name placed on the ballot is by writing it in? The only way he could receive a vote is by having his name written in?

Mr. WILSON. Oh, yes; by having the name written in. Quoting further the primary election law:

SEC. 9. That whenever a special election is held to fill a vacancy for an unexpired term caused by death, resignation, or otherwise of any officer, the respective committees having authority to call

primary elections to nominate candidates for said office shall have full authority to fix the date at which a primary election shall be held to nominate candidates in said special election, which date shall not be less than 10 days after the special election shall have been ordered.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Who called the primary that nominated Mr. Sanders?

Mr. WILSON. That was a mass meeting of citizens of the Sixth District.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was not a legally constituted organization?

Mr. WILSON. It was a mass meeting called for the purpose of holding an election. The claim for legality of the action of the committee presenting the nominee is based upon the exceptions made in the primary law after a primary election has been called.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON. The only conditions under which a name may be certified as a party nominee on a Democratic ticket in Louisiana is set out under section 6 of the Primary Election Laws of Louisiana:

That all vacancies caused by death or resignation or otherwise among the nominees selected by any political party, under the provisions of this act, shall be filled by the committee, which has jurisdiction over the calling and ordering of the said primary election, and in the event that no person shall have applied to become a candidate for a political office within the time fixed by law, or the call of the committee ordering the primary, or in any other event wherein the party shall have no nominee selected under the provisions of this act, the committee calling the primary shall select the nominee for any position named in the call of the committee and shall have full authority to certify said name as the nominee of the said party.

There is no way under the law or under this provision of law whereby anyone's name can be placed upon that ticket as the nominee of the Democratic Party except after a primary has been called and a vacancy occurs by death or resignation or there may be some office for which no one has offered as a candidate.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have simply taken this time to clear up the matter so far as I can and give my construction of the law on account of what was said about the case on yesterday.

The Governor of Louisiana had waited more than 6 months after the vacancy occurred. He had had plenty of time to have given all opportunity to anybody who wanted to be a candidate, but he calls the election to be held within 7 days, with no time for a primary and the committee makes the certification without having ordered a primary, when the direct provision of the law is that no such certification can be made except by the committee calling a primary and after the primary election had been called. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made earlier in the day, and if I can secure them in time to include some statistics from the C.W.A.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. McCARTHY].

Mrs. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture recently issued a report giving the results of the wheat allotment plan.

The results were somewhat discouraging, and because of this fact I have introduced two bills, which, to my mind, would help to correct the situation. One of my bills is a bill to license the producer and the other one provides a tax on expansion of acreage.

The first bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to license producers who do not reduce their acreage. The theory behind this measure is that such licensing power would be used only when necessary to hold down threatened expansions. In the event the Secretary of Agriculture would decide that reduction of acreage was not necessary, he would not be compelled to exercise this licensing authority. Use of the tax plan on additional acreage is also optional.

I will now give you some information about this report issued by the Department.

The 11 principal wheat States went along with the Department's program and greatly reduced their acreage.

For example, in the State of Kansas 97 percent of the wheat farmers reduced their acreage the agreed 15 percent. In these 11 wheat States 33,000,000 acres is the amount of winter wheat planted last fall as compared with thirty-six and a half million acres, which is the annual average during the base period, 1929 to 1931. This reduction, 77 percent of the gross reduction expected, shows that the winter-wheat States are responding well to the adjustment plan. On the other hand, taking the Nation as a whole, 41,000,000 acres of wheat were seeded this fall as compared with the 42,500,000 for the fall of 1932, giving a reduction from last year's planting of only 4 percent for the entire Nation. As compared with the base period, fall plantings are 7.2 percent less.

These figures mean a great deal to a Member from the greatest wheat State in the Nation. Closer study shows that while wheat-State farmers have practically all pledged to control acreage, farmers in the eastern Corn Belt, on the northern edge of the Cotton Belt, and in the Northeast have increased their wheat acreage, their reason, of course, being that they hope to realize the higher prices resulting from the reductions of the regular wheat farmers.

One bill I have introduced places a per-acre tax on plantings in excess of that during the base period, the tax being paid into the wheat allotment fund.

The other measure I propose is simply to give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to place under license all farmers not cooperating in a production-control plan if they display evidence of extending their wheat acreage or other surplus crop above the amount ordinarily raised by them in their regular rotation of crops. Neither plan would work a hardship on anyone, but would give assurance to those farmers who have contracted to reduce their operations in a given product that they would not be penalized for joining in a great program to control production and raise the level of farm prices. This measure is similar to the one giving licensing powers to the N.R.A. Administrator, and such power should also be valid for the A.A.A.

The benefits of the allotment plan have been made clearly apparent to the wheat industry. Farmers have received 65 to 75 cents per bushel for their grain instead of 24 to 30 cents. Wheat producers are now receiving the first installment of the \$102,000,000 adjustment payment. Their incomes have been doubled, and for the first time in 10 years they feel they are attaining permanent stability through the adjustment program. For the good of this industry it is important that the plan not be jeopardized by actions of a minority not dependent on wheat, and in return the wheat farmer is, no doubt, willing to restrain from expanding his production of hogs, or other products, as the case may be.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BLANCHARD].

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, there are just a few observations I want to make on the Kemp case, inasmuch as it was discussed yesterday and again today.

It is an important question, and I am pleased that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] asked a question with reference to the prima facie right of a person to be administered the oath of office when credentials are presented from a sovereign State in the proper manner.

I am glad this matter has been cleared up, because I believe the RECORD should be kept absolutely straight and that it be made clear that any individual who comes with

proper credentials should not be denied the right to take the oath of office.

There have been, of course, two notable exceptions to the general procedure, and I question at least one of them; the decision of the House in the Berger case, where the oath was denied. In the other case, the Utah case, I am not familiar enough with it to speak with any degree of knowledge.

Now, I want to present three propositions for consideration. The first is the prima facie right of a person to take the oath of office unless there are objections, constitutional or legal, against it. Secondly, the propriety of Congress going back of an election and determining whether or not the nomination is properly made, and thirdly, the election itself.

In connection with the propriety of Congress investigating the nomination, I want to call your attention to the case of Wise against Young in the Fifty-fifth Congress:

The contestee introduced much in his answer and something in his testimony concerning the manner of the contestant's nomination. Now, in the case of Lowry against White it was well said:

"In contested cases it is improper to consider allegations in the testimony intended to show simply by what means the person became a candidate." And so we dispose of that question. (Hinds Precedents, vol. 2, sec. 1103.)

In the same connection I desire to call your attention to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, which specifically excludes from its operation primaries and conventions of political parties, recognizing to that extent a lack of jurisdiction by Congress to legislate concerning such instrumentalities for the selection of candidates.

If we are to pass on the legality of the situation in Louisiana, in the Sixth Congressional District, the failure on the part of the Governor of the State to call an election in ample time so that the primary or the run-off primary might be held, then I think the conclusion is quite clear that there is no legal election in this case.

As has been so well stated, the law is specific that no candidate unless nominated in accordance with the laws of the State of Louisiana can have his name placed on the ballot.

Again, I repeat that if we are to go back of the election there is only one conclusion we can arrive at and that is that the election was not proper and not legal.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. COX. It is not a fact that the precedents of the House and the Senate are that either body has the right to pass upon the right of a candidate to sit in that House, and to go back of the election?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The Senate has its rules and it is a fact they do go back of the election.

Mr. COX. And the precedents of the House are all in support of that proposition.

Mr. BLANCHARD. On the question of the election itself I cite this provision of the Louisiana law:

That in case of vacancy in said office of Representatives in Congress between the general elections, it shall be the duty of the Governor, by proclamation, to cause an election to be held according to law to fill such vacancy.

That pertains not to the primary election but to the election to fill the vacancy.

The language is significant "To cause an election to be held according to law." What law? Not a law promulgated by the Governor of Louisiana, but a law promulgated by the legislature, a law in existence in the State where this arises.

And by any process of reasoning we must in this case, if we are to examine the primary election laws in Louisiana, conclude that the people were foreclosed from having any right to hold a primary election, and on the question of the election itself there was no legal election on the basis of this law.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Yes.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman two questions that are easily answered. Do the election laws of Louisiana require that in a special election the candidate must be nominated before his name is put on the ticket?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I answer that as I answered the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], that the law specifically says that any candidate nominated in any other way than by the laws of the State of Louisiana—and they refer to the primary election laws—is not entitled to have his name on the ballot.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. I do not think the gentleman has answered my question clearly.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I think I did.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. I want to know if the laws require that a person to be elected in a special election has to be nominated in the primary?

Mr. BLANCHARD. My contention is that he must assuredly be selected in the primary.

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. The other question is, Does the law require the Governor to call an election far enough in advance to have the primary election held?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It presupposes—

Mr. TERRELL of Texas. "Presupposes" is not the law.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The gentleman has a right to his interpretation. There are interpretations—and they will be found in the brief and argument submitted to this committee—which contend that this election could be held without the necessity of a primary election, but they base their conclusions on what they regard to be the law of the State of Louisiana. That is not my conclusion, however. Yesterday in the argument on this same point, the question was raised as to whether or not under the Governor's proclamation the primaries could be held in time to permit an election prior to the convening of Congress on January 3. That is not controlling. We had a case in the State of Wisconsin in the Fifth District, now represented by my able colleague, Mr. O'MALLEY, where there was no representation for a period of 2 years.

It is always unfortunate when a district is without representation, but the Governor of Louisiana had ample time to provide a date for the election so that primaries could be held, and his failure to issue the call in proper time is surely no reason why we should overlook the laws governing the case. This House cannot be held responsible for the laws passed by a State, but we are responsible when it comes to an interpretation of those laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training stations: For maintenance, operation, and other necessary expenses, including repairs, improvements, and care of grounds of the naval training stations which follow:

San Diego, Calif., \$155,150.
Newport, R.I., \$46,813.
Great Lakes, Ill., \$227,503.
Norfolk, Va., \$215,950.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CONDON: Page 7, line 22, after the words "Rhode Island", strike out "\$46,813" and insert "\$191,211."

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent from this naval appropriation bill and the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on yesterday that the Navy is about to be greatly enlarged and brought up to the strength authorized by the London Naval Treaty. This is what many of us, who believe in an adequate Navy, have long sought for but scarcely hoped to see. The consummation of this patriotic purpose will be not the least of the crowning glories of this administration of which it now seems there are to be many. It further appears quite clearly from the speech that followed later in the day by the able Chairman of the great Committee on Naval Affairs that steps will be taken without delay to authorize the immediate

building of much needed ships in all categories. This announcement brought a favorable response from the House and there is no doubt but that its publication in the press has by this time brought a like favorable response from the country.

The American people want a great Navy, and they will no longer tolerate, much less support, the pursuit of a mistaken policy, based upon a misunderstanding of the policies of other nations, which has prevented too long the building of the Navy to treaty strength.

Naturally I am for that kind of a Navy, and I was happy to hear what was said here yesterday in the direction of our getting it in the not distant future. But when I looked further into this bill I was much surprised to find little, if any, consideration given to the present and future needs of the most essential part of such a Navy, namely, the enlisting and training of an adequate enlisted personnel.

Ships without men are as useless and silly as guns without ammunition. And yet this bill gives scant consideration to this vital need. In this matter the subcommittee is still thinking in terms of the false economy of last year which stripped all but one of our naval training stations of apprentices in training and practically stopped all recruiting throughout the country. I am informed that this policy has now been scrapped and that it is the intention of the Department to resume training activities in preparation for the increased demand for men that must come with the completion of these new ships. If that is true, the training stations must be reopened and put on an active operating basis, and it must be true if we are not going to have another long list of empty expensive ships of war rotting at their docks waiting for the junk pile.

In this regard let me say a word about the naval training station at Newport, R.I., which I am sorry to say has been grossly overlooked by this committee. This station is now on a bare maintenance basis. No recruits are being trained there. This was in accord with the economy program of last spring. Unless the committee reconsiders its action and appropriates at least the amount contained in the last appropriation bill no recruits will be trained there this year. In other words, Newport will continue on a so-called "economy basis." Why? If there is a reasonable answer, I have not heard it.

The other three stations, San Diego, Great Lakes, and Hampton Roads, by this bill receive approximately the same appropriation as in the last supply bill. It is difficult, and I undertake to say here impossible, to justify this discrimination on any basis of economy or sound naval policy. I do not know the adequacy of these other stations for training purposes. I assume that they are needed, and I make no criticism of their treatment by the committee. But I do know the character and high quality of the facilities at Newport. I do know the favorable and unique situation which this station enjoys for training our naval apprentices. I do know the high competency and the splendid history of this station in producing the fighting men of our Navy since 1883.

It was in that year that the station was established by Secretary of the Navy William E. Chandler on land ceded to the United States by the State of Rhode Island without compensation. Its location there has ever since been considered by those competent to judge, a wise decision. There are many reasons for this but I shall mention but a few of them. Its location on Narragansett Bay is in proximity to shipping of every description and thus the new recruit is introduced to a point of view of nautical life unsurpassed elsewhere. Narragansett Bay has long been a favorable concentration point for the fleet in the North Atlantic and ships are constantly calling there, thus facilitating easy delivery and reception of personnel. New York is within easy steaming distance, as are related stations at Portsmouth, Boston, and New London. The station itself has a high record for healthfulness and is an ideal place from this standpoint for the training of young men.

All of these natural advantages are important, but equally important is the fact that over the years since 1883 the

Government has invested millions of dollars here in developing and bringing up to a high state of efficiency the physical plant of an up-to-date, modern naval-training station. It was testified in the hearings before the committee by Admiral Leahy (p. 142) that the investment was \$4,729,076.

The barracks at this station are all of brick construction, fundamentally staunch, and good for years of use in the future. While this station remains closed these fine modern buildings are empty and idle, a source of expense to the Government without yielding the slightest return, and inevitably deteriorating and depreciating notwithstanding all efforts at maintenance. What excuse is there, what can there be, for neglecting to utilize such facilities in the face of the intention of the Department to train, at Hampton Roads, 4,812 recruits this coming fiscal year, partly in old war-time frame buildings, which are difficult to maintain and expensive to heat, as testified to at the hearings by Captain McCain on page 145?

If there is such an excuse, I hope the committee will let the House know of it. It neither appears in the hearings nor in the report of the committee.

How can the failure to provide for the resumption of training at Newport be justified on any plea of economy or otherwise when the Great Lakes station has had its full appropriation of 1934 restored, and this in spite of a contrary Budget estimate and without any request therefor by the Department? The argument made by the committee in its report to support its action can be made with even greater force and cogency for Newport. I suggest that the committee reconsider its action in this matter and restore the 1934 appropriation of \$191,211 for Newport. Let it leave to the further reflection of the Department the matter of reopening this station, as it has done in the case of the Great Lakes, according to its own report, on page 8, as follows, referring to Great Lakes:

The committee has added to the Budget a total of \$376,697, in order that the Department may be free to reopen the station if upon further reflection it should decide to pursue that course.

I am asking for fair play in this matter and no favors. I am completely willing to leave the question of the usefulness and efficiency of the Newport station to the sound judgment of the Department, because I am convinced of the unsurpassed qualifications of that station to perform this essential service to the Navy. This very matter has been inquired into before by naval experts, and, after full and exhaustive investigation, they reported their findings, which are a matter of public record. In January 1923 the so-called "Rodman Board" reported as follows:

The board recommends that training activities on the Atlantic coast be centered at the naval training station at Newport, R.I.

That report, signed by 4 admirals and 3 captains of the Navy, was approved by the Secretary of the Navy on June 26, 1923, and to my knowledge has never been superseded by any subsequent report based upon an investigation of comparable scope and character as the Rodman inquiry.

Improvements at other training stations, it is true, have been made since the above date, making them more competent to perform efficient training service, but in no particular has Newport suffered the loss of any of the natural and material advantages that appealed so strongly to the expert minds of this board at that time.

In the face of this evidence it seems to me that the committee ought to fairly reconsider this matter and restore the appropriation of 1934, and I hope that the chairman will accept the amendment.

The same consideration ought to have been given to Newport as has been given to the Great Lakes, and again I repeat I have no criticism whatever to make of the appropriation that has been made for the Great Lakes. I am asking for fair play in this matter and no favors. I appreciate the fact that this country ought not to spend a single unnecessary dollar for any part of maintaining its great Naval Establishment unless that dollar can bring back to the country something of value. I am not asking anything for Newport merely because it happens to be in my district. I believe that Newport is incomparably the best

station on the Atlantic coast to train these men. I am completely willing to leave that question in the discretion of the Department and let them say whether or not this station should or should not be open during the year 1935. Admiral Rodman and his associates declared this training station was the only training station on the Atlantic coast at which ought to be centered the training of apprentices of our Navy.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDON. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. Can the gentleman tell us what part of the country most of the apprentices are recruited from that have been trained at Newport?

Mr. CONDON. The Newport Training Station, I am informed, serves New England, New York, and New Jersey. Boys coming from that particular section of the country were always trained at Newport.

Mr. HEALEY. So that quite an item of expense would be involved in sending those recruits elsewhere?

Mr. CONDON. I am reliably informed that it is more expensive to send recruits from that section of the country, particularly New England and New York, to Hampton Roads or to any of the other stations than it is to send them to Newport. That makes a very substantial increase in expense for the station at Hampton Roads and the one at Great Lakes.

Mr. HEALEY. Is it not a fact that the amount of the increased appropriation you have asked for in your amendment, \$144,000, will not be saved by not using the facilities at Newport, but that the depreciation of those facilities, plus the expense of sending those recruits elsewhere will more than amount to the sum you have asked?

Mr. CONDON. It is quite likely that will happen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CONDON] has again expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should like to join in urging the adoption of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CONDON]. I live in a State in very close proximity to the Naval Station at Newport, R.I. It is easily accessible to thousands of recruits from New England who join the Navy. It is ideally equipped, and it is in the interest of economy that this station be continued. I sincerely trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be agreed to.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDON. I yield.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. The gentleman spoke a moment ago about the extra expense of sending recruits from New England and New Jersey and New York to Norfolk. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that after recruits have been trained at Newport it is necessary to send the major portion of them to Norfolk anyway, either to join with ships based there or for transfer to the Pacific via naval transport?

Mr. CONDON. I do not understand it is necessary to send those men to Norfolk to get additional training aboard ship. I have talked with officers at Newport and it is my understanding that ships come into Newport regularly, and have taken on apprentices from the naval station for their fleet training. I talked this matter over with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Roosevelt, last spring, and he was not then in a position to tell us there was going to be any saving by concentrating the training at Hampton Roads on the Atlantic coast. He was not able to controvert our argument that there was a distinct saving in having these men from the northeastern section of the country trained at Newport.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDON. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. About how many men are trained there?

Mr. CONDON. The training station has been closed for the past few months.

Mr. MILLARD. But I mean when it is in full operation.

Mr. CONDON. They have trained as high as 2,600 men at Newport, as I understand it.

Mr. MILLARD. All from the section of the country to which the gentleman referred a moment ago?

Mr. CONDON. All from the Northeastern States; yes, sir.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as much as I think of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CONDON] and as much as I think of the good citizens of Newport, at the same time I must oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island for the reason that it is absolutely unnecessary to open the Newport Training Station. In the first place, under this bill we will have a training station operating on the Pacific coast at San Diego. We will have a training station at Chicago, which is in the center of the United States, as near as it can be placed, assuming that the department will reopen it, and we will have one on the Atlantic coast at Norfolk. That is all that are necessary. Those three training stations can accommodate and train over 19,000 recruits a year—19,088, to be exact. There will not be more than 10,000 recruits trained next year, so what is the use of going to the expense of opening another training station on the Atlantic coast? In other words, it is time for us to begin to think of confining appropriations to the necessities or essentials in order to have enough to provide for the Navy in an efficient way and not be making appropriations where it is not necessary simply to satisfy a local demand.

Now, on that score the gentleman ought not to have any complaint. Newport is very well taken care of. For instance, Newport has a naval hospital where we spent in 1933 \$187,151. Newport has a Navy purchasing office where we spent in that year \$36,977.55; it has a Navy torpedo station where the 1933 expenditures totaled \$3,190,410. It has a naval station, not a training station but a naval station, for which the 1933 expenditures totaled \$262,252, and a naval war college, all at Newport, for which the expenditures during 1933 amounted to \$739,656, or, all told, \$4,416,448. Newport has no ground for complaint—or at least no just ground—that it is not being fairly treated. It is an absolutely useless expenditure to open up the Newport Training Station, because, as I said, with the training station on the Pacific coast, the one in the interior at Great Lakes, and the one on the Atlantic coast at Norfolk, we will have more than enough accommodations for the training of recruits. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CONDON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONDON) there were ayes 19 and noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures in line 24.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CONDON] made a splendid effort, worthy of his reputation, in behalf of his training station, and I want to compliment him upon the comprehensive way in which he presented the facts. I wish I could have supported his amendment; but being at all times for strict and rigid economy, I could not conscientiously do so.

I feel that the committee, under the leadership of the able gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], has been eminently fair in making appropriations and recommendations, and I myself have cause to be and am thankful to him and to his subcommittee for the splendid way they have treated the great Middle West.

Before leaving Washington some weeks ago I called attention to the fact that the Middle West was again being discriminated against when the Navy Department eliminated the appropriation for the Great Lakes Training Station. Therefore I am indeed thankful and greatly appreciate, and I know the people of the Middle West will greatly appreciate, the fact that there has been provided the sum of \$227,503

for the purpose of reopening the Great Lakes Training Station.

I am sure no one will charge me with being desirous of supporting large appropriations for the Army and the Navy; nevertheless, I believe that we are legislating in the right direction when we provide for the reopening of the Great Lakes Training Station. During the war and up to a year ago I think more young men were trained at that station than at any of the other stations.

Invariably the Great Lakes region gets but little in comparison with the South and the East; so this little appropriation will be thankfully received.

I shall not dwell longer upon the need for this appropriation. I am not fearful of any of these statements I hear and articles I read from time to time about the approaching dangers of war. Such things appear invariably just preceding the time we have a military or a naval bill before us. There are a certain number of gentlemen in Japan who like to hear themselves talk. Why, to me it is amusing that these gentlemen even could contemplate for one moment provoking war with this great powerful Nation of ours. So it is not through the prompting of such statements that I support this item, but it is for the purpose of enabling the young men of the Middle West to be trained in their own section of the country and to save them and their parents all unnecessary expenditures of going way down East or way out on the coast. I feel the reopening of this station will be of great help and economical benefit in general.

During general debate today I was amused when I heard these gentlemen from the East, especially the gentleman from Massachusetts, demanding with vigor and determination that there be an investigation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Well do I remember his attitude and the attitude of the other Members on his side of the House when in 1930, and long before that, I demanded upon this floor honest investigation of certain nefarious practices and conduct. Invariably when the opportunity was given me to secure a vote of the House, I did not see him backing my arguments or hear his voice voting with me for any of those much-needed investigations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell us some of the investigations he brought up on the floor? I think the House will be interested to hear of them.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I shall be pleased to explain some of them to the gentleman. I asked for and urged and insisted upon an investigation of the stock exchange in 1929. Day after day on the floor of the House I pleaded that we investigate that den of incorrigible gamblers, as well as the damnable investment bankers who brought wreck, ruin, and sorrow to America.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Not now. I shall be glad to yield in a minute.

I also demanded in 1930 an investigation of the Federal Reserve Board. That was the time when most of us thought the Federal Reserve Board should be a little more liberal in accepting for rediscount the \$2,000,000,000 of finance corporations' paper, short-term municipal bonds, and mortgages on homes, which would have saved the Nation from the resultant destruction and the closing of hundreds of small banks; but under the leadership of the party to which the gentleman belongs, which is, happily for America, a decadent party, I could not secure any favorable consideration notwithstanding my continuous appeals.

I also requested and urged an investigation of the Treasury Department, as the gentleman knows, when we desired to find out who were the beneficiaries of the \$3,000,000 of tax refunds under Mellon's and Mills' Republican administration; but we could not secure any favorable action or cooperation from the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

The gentleman also remembers, perhaps, that in 1932 I asked for the investigation of the Post Office Department in the matter of unconscionable air mail contracts, exorbitant leases, and the purchase of undesirable sites. True, we did pass that resolution and secured a few votes for it on the Republican side. Of course I was grateful for that. But since that time it has been demonstrated that the investigation should have been conducted more thoroughly by the House Committee, with enlarged powers and more facilities, so that it would not have been necessary for the Senate committees to investigate, as they are doing, not only the air mail contracts, but also the stock exchange. I do not mean to infer that the House Post Office Committee was derelict. It did very well indeed with the facilities at hand.

I think it would have been better had the House listened to me and voted a reasonable appropriation for such investigations.

I also demanded and insisted upon an investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation when the unwarranted loan of \$95,000,000 was made to Mr. Dawes' bank. I am reliably informed that we are going to lose between \$50,000,000 and \$55,000,000 on that single loan; but to date I have not seen or heard any of the Members on the Republican side asking or advocating any such investigation.

As the gentleman knows I also made a strenuous effort to secure an investigation of the moving-picture industry. That was during the last session of Congress. The gentleman knows how the Republicans were whipped into line by Mr. Hays, Mr. Hilles, Mr. Mayer, Judge Henning, and a few other leading Republicans; and I was voted down.

Last but not least, I recall that very few gentlemen on the Republican side helped by voting for the resolution to investigate the gigantic bankruptcy-receivership ring throughout the United States, which investigation is now going on with the approval of the general public, including the American Bar Association. It is hoped that I have briefly given the gentleman [Mr. TABER] some of the investigations I have sponsored and some of which were ordered by the House without the assistance or approval of any leading Republicans. I hope I will in the near future have opportunity to dwell at length upon what has been accomplished by these investigations, which were all for the general public good and not for selfish political purposes, as the proposed investigation of the C.W.A., the administration of which agency is in the State of Illinois and elsewhere in the Middle West, unfortunately, in the hands of Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of making a statement to the committee.

My reason for making the statement at this time is because I am compelled to leave. For this reason I wish to call to the attention of the committee an amendment I should like to offer to the bill. The section of the bill dealing with Naval Reserves reads as follows:

NAVAL RESERVE

For expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve and Naval Militia; pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when employed on authorized training duty; mileage for officers while traveling under orders to and from training duty; transportation of enlisted men to and from training duty, and subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; subsistence of enlisted men during the actual

period of training duty; subsistence of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve while performing authorized training or other duty without pay; pay, mileage, and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve and pay, allowances, and subsistence of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when ordered to active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve; pay officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve for the performance of not to exceed 48 drills per annum or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties, and administrative duties, exclusive, however, of pay, allowances, or other expenses on account of members of any class of the Naval Reserve incident to their being given flight training unless, as a condition precedent, they shall have been found by such agency as the Secretary of the Navy may designate physically and psychologically qualified to serve as pilots of naval aircraft, \$2,745,509, of which amount not more than \$150,000 shall be available for maintenance and rental of armories, including pay of necessary janitors, and for wharfage; not more than \$81,000 shall be available for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department; not less than \$614,196 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for aviation material, equipment, fuel, and rental of hangars, not more than \$397,914 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for fuel and the transportation thereof, and for all other expenses in connection with the maintenance, operation, repair, and upkeep of vessels assigned for training the Naval Reserve, and of such total sum \$978,491 shall be available exclusively for and on account of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve aviation: *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay more than one officer of the Naval Reserve and one officer of the Marine Corps Reserve above the grade of lieutenant or captain, respectively, the pay and allowances of their grade for the performance of active duty other than the performance of drills or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties, and/or the performance of 15 days' active training duty, and other officers above such grades employed on such class of active duty shall not be entitled to or be paid a greater rate of pay and allowances than authorized by law for a lieutenant of the Navy or a captain of the Marine Corps entitled to not exceeding 10 years' longevity pay: *Provided further*, That no appropriation made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling or other expenses of any officer or enlisted man of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States; and "retired pay" as here used shall not include the pay of transferred members of such reserve forces.

I should like to offer an amendment on page 13, raising the appropriation from \$2,745,509 to \$2,776,761 for this reason:

The Naval Reserve appropriation contains a proviso to the effect that only one Naval Reserve officer above the rank of lieutenant and one Marine Corps Reserve officer above the rank of captain employed on active duty may receive the pay of their grades, as contemplated by basic law governing the Naval Reserve, and that all other officers employed on active duty in connection with necessary Reserve activities, shall receive only the pay of a lieutenant of the Navy of 10 years' service.

This proviso would appear to constitute legislation contrary or in addition to existing law. It was first contained in the Naval Reserve appropriation for the fiscal year 1933; it was repeated for the fiscal year 1934; and it appears to be the intention of the committee to continue this proviso indefinitely, since it is again repeated for the fiscal year 1935.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman will remember that we fought this thing out once before and learned that it was not subject to a point of order. Therefore it will be necessary to accomplish the objective by amendment. The committee does not feel at this time that they should make any change whatsoever. So these Reserve officers who are drawing lieutenants' pay or captains' pay are deprived of the rights they otherwise would enjoy in regard to pay.

Mr. DELANEY. That is true.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. There is absolutely nothing that can be done as far as changing the law except by amendment, as it was carried in the previous appropriation bills, and is not subject to a point of order. The committee declines to accept an amendment.

Mr. DELANEY. I made that statement at the beginning of these remarks.

Of the 31 Naval Reserve officers on necessary active duty in connection with Naval Reserve activities throughout the country, 17 are affected by this proviso, of whom 4 are of the rank of captain, 2 are of the rank of commander, and the balance are of the rank of lieutenant commander. The duties performed by all of these officers are most necessary, and are in accordance with rank. If an officer of the Regular Navy should be assigned to the same duties it would be necessary that one of approximately the same rank be designated. However, due to the greater familiarity of the Reserve officers themselves, with the various features of their work, Regular Navy officers could not perform the work with equal efficiency.

The injustice of compelling a captain of the Naval Reserve to accept the pay of a lieutenant, and on top of that the reduction of 10 to 15 percent applied to all Government employees, is too patent to need discussion, and too iniquitous to be retained in this bill.

The entire Naval Reserve resents this stigma which has been placed upon them, in that theirs is the only branch of all the Federal service whose officers are not considered worthy to receive the pay of their rank.

In the event of the elimination of the proviso, an additional \$31,252 would be required in the total amount of the appropriation.

The changes are as I have indicated above. That is all I desire to say, except to voice my protest against this legislation at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Instruction: For post-graduate instruction of officers in other than civil government and literature, and for special instruction, education, and individual training of officers and enlisted men at home and abroad, including maintenance of students abroad, except aviation training and submarine training otherwise appropriated for, and for the care and operation of schools at naval stations, Guantanamo Bay and Tutuila, for the children of Naval and Marine Corps commissioned, enlisted, and civilian personnel, \$159,772;

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSS. Line 16, after the word "for", down to and including the word "personnel" in line 20. I understand this provides for the current operation of schools at naval stations in Cuba, Guantanamo Bay, Tutuila, and Samoa. It seems to me this is putting the old nose of the camel under the tent. It is new legislation that has not been covered before in bills, and it seems to me that we should not create the precedent in this bill of establishing new schools for enlisted men, officers, or others without having the Military Affairs Committee go into the subject. It seems to me that is an injustice to other parts of the world where we have naval stations. It would perhaps be an injustice to naval stations in our own land. I want to ask the chairman if this is not brandnew language, simply putting the camel's nose under the tent, in this appropriation bill rather than having hearings before the committee and determining a policy in reference to this matter?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. We had hearings before the committee. There is no question but what the language to which the gentleman refers is subject to a point of order. It is relatively a very small matter. It will only cost \$1,600.

Mr. GOSS. I understand it only costs \$1,600 this time, but next year we will have another bill come in without proper hearings, and that will make this a uniform practice in connection with all of our naval stations, Mr. Chairman, and therefore I am going to make the point of order so it will be handled in the proper way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that the provisions referred to are legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL RESERVE

For expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve and Naval Militia; pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when employed on authorized training duty; mileage for officers while traveling under orders to

and from training duty; transportation of enlisted men to and from training duty, and subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; subsistence of enlisted men during the actual period of training duty; subsistence of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve while performing authorized training or other duty without pay; pay, mileage, and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve and pay, allowances, and subsistence of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when ordered to active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve; pay of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve for the performance of not to exceed 48 drills per annum or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties, and administrative duties, exclusive, however, of pay, allowances, or other expenses on account of members of any class of the Naval Reserve incident to their being given flight training unless, as a condition precedent, they shall have been found by such agency as the Secretary of the Navy may designate physically and psychologically qualified to serve as pilots of naval aircraft, \$2,745,509, of which amount not more than \$150,000 shall be available for maintenance and rental of armories, including pay of necessary janitors, and for wharfage; not more than \$81,000 shall be available for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department; not less than \$614,196 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for aviation material, equipment, fuel, and rental of hangars, not more than \$397,914 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for fuel and the transportation thereof, and for all other expenses in connection with the maintenance, operation, repair, and upkeep of vessels assigned for training the Naval Reserve, and of such total sum \$978,491 shall be available exclusively for and on account of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, aviation: *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay more than one officer of the Naval Reserve and one officer of the Marine Corps Reserve above the grade of lieutenant or captain, respectively, the pay and allowances of their grade for the performance of active duty other than the performance of drills or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties, and/or the performance of 15 days' active training duty, and other officers above such grades employed on such class of active duty shall not be entitled to or be paid a greater rate of pay and allowances than authorized by law for a lieutenant of the Navy or a captain of the Marine Corps entitled to not exceeding 10 years' longevity pay: *Provided further*, That no appropriation made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling or other expenses of any officer or enlisted man of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States; and "retired pay" as here used shall not include the pay of transferred members of such reserve forces.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I wish to commend the committee for restoring in this bill the funds to provide for 36 drills instead of 24 now enjoyed by the Naval Reserve. I am very much interested in the Naval Reserve, because of the fact that in the city of Atlanta, which I have the privilege of representing, although it is located 300 miles from the Atlantic Ocean, we have a unit of the Naval Reserve which for 3 consecutive years has won the title of being the best-trained unit in the United States. The late Admiral Rabey presented to that unit in Atlanta the trophy which they won for the third consecutive time this last summer.

I think it is to the credit of this fine group of young men who give up their hours in the evening, men who are employed in the regular vocations of business and devote their time to studying the tactics of the Navy so that in time of need they can come to the assistance of our Government. They are entitled to special credit, since they have no method of securing training on the water, being 300 miles away from the ocean, except when they are on a cruise each summer. These men give up their vacations each year for the purpose of fitting themselves to answer the call of this great Government should they be needed. I wish to pay this tribute to that fine group of men and to assure the committee that I hope next year they will be able to restore to them 48 drills, which they ought to have.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The committee has been very liberal to the Naval Reserve and they have not only increased the number of drills of the Naval Reserve, but they have increased the flying hours, although the estimate did not provide for this.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. We increased the drills from 24, the number to which they have been administratively restricted this year, to 36, and we increased the Budget esti-

mate for the flying hours from 30 to 45 hours. We have been very liberal with the Naval Reserve, in my judgment.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman from Atlanta speaks of being 300 miles away from the sea. We have a Naval Reserve in our city and we are 1,000 miles away from the sea. They are very much interested in their work. As the gentleman knows, and I have called it to his attention on numerous occasions, I realize the situation that confronts the committee, but I do want to express the hope that when the situation will permit the committee will provide for the 48 drills.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I may say further to the gentleman from Missouri that we also have provided for the 15-day cruises.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOBBINS: On page 13, beginning in line 18, after the word "provided", strike out the remainder of that line and the following lines down to and including all of line 5 on page 14.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out the proviso against which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] protested a few minutes ago.

This amendment is offered for the purpose of striking out of the paragraph the words which limit the pay of 17 reserve officers who are detailed to active duty, ignoring the fact that they have earned and are entitled to enjoy a rank higher than that of lieutenant. These officers have the positions to which they are now assigned because they deserved the promotions that brought them this rank. There are 17 of them, not enough to have numerous friends on the floor of the House, but that is no reason they should not have justice in the matter of pay. They are doing the work now.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Does the gentleman know there is not a single one of these officers who is compelled to accept this duty which he is performing now? Not even the President of the United States could compel one of these men to serve on active duty in time of peace. It is entirely voluntary on their part.

Mr. DOBBINS. There is hardly an officer of this Government who is drafted into service, but the Government needs their services or it would not be utilizing them. The Government is utilizing the services of these men and declining to give in return, by reason of this provision, a fair rate of pay to them.

I have heard no explanation of why a captain or a commander or a lieutenant commander who is assigned to this work and who is performing this duty should receive the pay of a lieutenant who has only had 10 years of service in the Navy. I cannot conceive of any explanation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, if the Government is to utilize the services of these men, it should pay them according to their worth. Of course, it may be argued that the pay is high. The pay of any senior officer of the Army or Navy when he has attained a high degree of proficiency and efficiency may seem to some rather high, but they are performing services that merit that pay. One of them is acting as adviser of the Naval Affairs Committee of the other body in this building. He is capable and competent and is a lieutenant commander and yet receives only a lieutenant's pay.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this proviso should be eliminated.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just offered.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am personally concerned—and I am inclined to think I speak for the balance of the committee, although I cannot state that positively—I do not see any need to have any Reserve officers in active service, with the possible exception of 1 administering Marine Reserve and 1 administering Navy Reserve affairs, and yet we have 31.

In the first place, we have about 381 surplus regular naval officers who could perform these duties just as well as the Reserve officers who are now performing them, and save this expense.

The National Guard, which is a much larger organization than the Naval Reserve, has not more than five officers performing active duty and receiving pay for it.

As chairman of the committee I may say that if anyone on the floor of this House should offer an amendment that no Reserve officer shall receive pay for the performance of continuous active duty, I should not object to it for a single moment, except, as I said, one with the Navy and one with the Marines as general administrative officers. We do not need any more. We have plenty of Regular officers who can perform these duties, and there is no need of building up an organization of this kind and using officers of the Reserve to perform active duty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am impelled to say a few words about this after hearing the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill mention his opposition to the placing upon active duty of any Reserve officers at all, and citing the National Guard as a comparable situation.

As a matter of fact, under the National Defense Act, National Guard officers may, and nearly all of them do, take out Reserve commissions in the same grade which they occupy in the Guard itself. As Reserve officers they are eligible for being ordered to active duty, and while on active duty, of course, they draw the pay of their grade.

I think the chairman of the committee is misinformed as to the number of National Guard officers thus placed from time to time upon active duty. There is a very considerable number of them, because it is the policy of the War Department, within its appropriations, to encourage as many National Guard officers holding Reserve commissions to go on duty for limited periods in order to weld them into the Army of the United States, as contrasted with the old policy which existed before the World War, and so long advocated and insisted upon by the old-fashioned Regular Army of keeping every citizen soldier in the background and refusing to give him a chance.

So National Guard officers, holding Reserve commissions, attend the Army schools. They go to Benning for 3 months, they go to the Signal Corps for 3 months, they go to the Field Artillery school for 3 months at a time, and serve with the General Staff for a year at a time, and while there they draw the pay of their grade.

The policy laid down by the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, if put into effect, will run absolutely contrary to the policy of the Army. The effort of the War Department is to popularize the Army and bring it closer to the people. The policy proposed by the chairman of the committee is to take the Navy away from the people and not let Naval Reserve officers serve with the Navy in any capacity in time of peace upon an active-duty status. It would be a great pity, and the amendment offered in this particular case will cure one of the grievances, one of the injuries, which from time to time is inflicted upon citizen sailors, as it used to be inflicted upon citizen soldiers by the professional services.

In this bill they are employed in active service, and in the same breath they say they are not worth the price of their grade. These men are sensitive.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Does the gentleman mean to say that there are Reserve officers in the Army serving on permanent active duty?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are ordered into active duty for various reasons.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I mean continuous active duty. We provide in this bill for Naval Reserve officers to be on active duty in the sense the gentleman means.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why discriminate in regard to the pay?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. We do not. This is permanent duty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That makes it worse, if it is permanent duty.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I should agree with the gentleman if the duty were of a necessary character. The gentleman is referring to another class of duty than that here in question. If I am not mistaken, the Army has no reserves on permanent continuous duty.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It depends on how you define "permanent." The officers succeed each other.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. We are talking about two different things altogether.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The principle is the same in respect to pay.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. It would be if it were necessary active duty in both cases. I am in agreement with what the gentleman has said as regards the class of duty he speaks of. But I am opposed to reserves being put on permanent active duty which can be performed by a regular naval officer at a saving to the Government. In other words, my aim is to do the same as is done in the National Guard.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman is not succeeding in getting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOBBINS), there were 17 ayes and 42 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 1, after the comma, strike out the sum "\$2,745,509" and insert "\$3,038,047."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a brief explanation will suffice. The figures I propose will permit the holding of 48 drills per year as compared with 36. If I am correctly informed, the past year the men were allowed to be paid for 24 drills. My plea is to put them on the statutory base, restoring it to 48 drills a year. The reason for that plea is this. It is these 48 drills which keep these men together, and keep their incentive held up during the long months of the year when they come in contact so very, very seldom with the naval authorities themselves. These weekly or nearly weekly drills are the ones which inbue into the men the basic training. I think it is fair to say that a very serious state of affairs arose in both the guard and the Naval Reserve as a result of the paid drills being cut in two, from 48 to 24. The amount involved is very small, compared with the total sums we are dealing in these days, and the money is exceedingly well spent, to my mind. The 48 drills are necessary for the maintenance of the discipline and basic training of these units, and I had hoped the committee would see fit to restore the statutory number of drills for the fiscal year 1935.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in support of the amendment, for many reasons. One reason is that this is the first of the supply bills coming out on national defense, and I take it that as the naval bill goes so will the Army bill go. If we have 48 drills in the Army bill, we want 48 drills in the Navy, because they are going to be treated alike.

Last year this Congress passed a new National Guard Act, which federalized the National Guard, with certain restrictions, which the membership will remember, and made the National Guard a component part of the Army. All of us know that the Regular Army is small enough. Perhaps in this territory of the United States it is just about twice the size of the New York police force. Surely, when we have federalized the guard, we do not want to cripple it to the extent of giving them 36 drills a year instead of 48.

It is well known by all the membership here that the people who come to make up our National Guard and the Reserve of the Navy, for the most part, are men who work in industry, men who work in stores. They are civilians. We ask them to give up 2 weeks of their time every year

to go to camp and train for active duty. What encouragement are we going to hold out to them for becoming more proficient in their line of duty unless we give them the proper number of drills throughout the fall, winter, and spring months to put them into good training so that they can make the best out of their summer practice. I appeal to the House at this particular time, because if we put back the 48 drills in the National Guard and the Naval Reserve it will cost the Government only 3½ million dollars for the next year. That surely is little enough to spend on the national-defense item in these strenuous times, with ships and men trained and ready to perform their duty. I ask gentlemen sincerely to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York. The amount is very small in this bill, \$292,538. It is little enough to put us on record as to supporting 48 drills in this bill, so that the House can be at least consistent when the War Department appropriation bill comes on the floor to support the 48 drills in that bill.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, of course, no one is in a position to say what will be done in connection with the War Department bill. All of the services should be treated alike. The President has recommended that they all be treated alike and he has proposed 36 drills. I think we have been very liberal in this matter. We have increased the drills from 24, the number to which the Reserves have been administratively limited to this year, to 36. In this connection let me read a paragraph from our hearings. On page 168 of the hearings, in response to a question I asked, Admiral Bloch, the Navy Budget officer, made this statement:

May I state that it was the decision of the President that the National Guard and the Marine Corps Reserve and the Naval Reserve should have a uniform number of paid drills during the fiscal year 1935. The President himself set the number at 36, so that the 36 paid drills incorporated in the estimate for 1935 are in conformity with his decision that the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps have the same number or 36 paid drills.

To increase the number to 48 would mean an increase in expenditure of roundly \$3,500,000 for all services.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. That is for both the War Department and this bill.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. This bill actually increases \$292,538.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. That is true; I mean for an increased number of drills for the three services. It seems to me we should not go beyond 36 drills at this time. It would occasion an extra expense that ought not to be incurred, and, therefore, I hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I agree with all that has been said about the efficiency of the National Guard units in the various States. As a matter of fact they are the backbone of our first line of defense in case of emergency. I happen to be quite familiar with the Ohio National Guard, with practically all of its higher officers, and having had the direction of the Ohio State Fair for 6 years, it was my privilege to employ the Ohio National Guard each year to police that fair. We always received more efficient service than we could receive from the local police.

These boys are not alone from the stores and the factories, but many of them are from the farms and from the rural communities. I personally have in my possession a number of letters from the boys in the Ohio National Guard, stating that up until the time of the inauguration of the C.W.A. program, they and their families lived upon the meager drill pay received from the Government.

I happen to know of instances in my home town where families of 4 or 5 or 6 actually weathered the storm through this little drill pay check that came in to these boys. Suppose it does cost a few hundred thousand or a million or so dollars, in these days when we are spending millions and billions of dollars to put people to work and keep them at work, I think every one of my colleagues will agree with me that this money should be appropriated. My

colleagues will also agree that if by any circumstance whatsoever the C.W.A. work should be discontinued at this time or in the near future, God only knows what might happen to this country. You are deluged with letters, as I am, from people who are employed on C.W.A. projects. As far as I am concerned, I expect to support any amount that may be asked for by the President of the United States to keep these men at work and give them a chance to have a job instead of a dole. Here is an opportunity to keep men on the pay roll, to give them an income so that they do not have to obtain C.W.A. jobs or do not have to be put on a dole. For one, I heartily concur with the amendment and expect to support it.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRUAX. I yield.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I understood the gentleman to say he was ready to support the President on any matters of this kind. The gentleman heard what I read a moment ago, that the President himself had determined that 36 drills would be sufficient.

Mr. TRUAX. I would reply to the gentleman by saying that I would vote on this amendment the same as I voted on the Economy Act—

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. In other words, the gentleman will support the President when he feels like it—

Mr. TRUAX. Please allow me to answer in my own way.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. TRUAX. I shall vote on this amendment the same as I voted when the Economy Act was before this House. I felt it was an injustice to war veterans. I felt that the President was misinformed on it, and I think since then he has partially rectified the mistake by liberalizing the act to the extent of \$21,000,000.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I suppose, pursuing the same reasoning, the gentleman assumes the President has been misinformed with reference to these drills?

Mr. TRUAX. I do not presume to say what the President thinks, nor to be his spokesman. I am reciting actual conditions as I know them, and I expect to vote for this amendment for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES of Kansas) there were ayes 33 and noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOBBINS: Page 14, line 3, after the word "than", insert the following: "the average between that authorized for their own grades and that".

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the nature of a compromise between the amendment I formerly offered, which was rejected by the committee, and the position advanced by the chairman of the subcommittee. It is a concession to the opinion of the chairman, in that he feels that Reserve officers should not be detailed to permanent active duty. It is also a concession, and I think a just concession, to the right of those men who are so assigned to be paid something according to their worth. This amendment, if I may explain it to the committee, provides that an officer above the rank of lieutenant, who is so assigned, shall receive half the difference between the lieutenant's pay and the rank which he enjoys. In other words, a captain who is assigned to this work shall receive pay midway between that of a lieutenant and the pay of a captain. Now, it is said that these positions are unnecessary. If they are, the way to get rid of them is to abolish the positions and not to penalize the men who are doing the work in those positions. It is just as logical to say, and I can agree with the principle, that there ought not be any Republicans in this House; but the Almighty, in His wisdom, has sent a few of them here, and while they are here they should be paid.

In other words, when assigned to the work from the Reserve, some of these officers are doing the same work as a captain in the Navy, but they are being paid according to the pay of a lieutenant in the Navy. I do not think they

should be penalized, because they wish to perform this service. Every one of us is here because he wishes to perform some service to his Government. They are occupying positions which the machinery of this Government has provided, and they should be paid according to their rank. I have not heard one word of explanation why a captain, with many years to his credit, much more experience to his credit, and more ability to his credit, should be subject to the humiliation of drawing a lieutenant's pay when he is assigned to this work; and I do not expect to hear any. This is a compromise. Perhaps I am not talking in a compromising tone of voice. However, this amendment recognizes the contention that these officers, who, through circumstances not within their control, are occupying positions which somebody thinks ought not exist at all, for that reason alone should not receive as much as others who are occupying similar positions. But the amendment also does make some difference between the pay of a captain and the pay of a lieutenant in those positions. A captain in the Navy and a lieutenant in the Navy are as far apart in rank as a colonel and a captain in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS] has expired.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, of course I could not accept a compromise of that kind. In the first place, my contention is that we do not need these officers on active duty at all. I have nothing to say against the individuals affected. They may be and probably are very fine gentlemen and thoroughly patriotic, and all that, but we do not need them, and if we allow them to be continued on active duty I think they ought to be well satisfied with a lieutenant's pay. We are not seeking to reduce any man's pay under \$4,158. They may draw that maximum rate as Reserve officers on active duty. As I said before, we have a surplus of regular officers who could take their places. We have a surplus of 381. I am just as much opposed to this compromise as I was to the original proposition. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Under our system of national defense we do not maintain a large standing Army. It is one of our national characteristics that we object to a large standing Army and a large Navy. Therefore we try to make up this lack somewhat by taking into our armed forces the civilian components of the Army. It is quite obvious that in order to maintain these civilian components in any degree of efficiency they must be given something to bring their morale up to the state where it should be. They must not be discouraged or they cannot exist as an efficient organization.

These men for the large part are men who give their vacations to this kind of training. They furnish their own uniforms; and when all is said and done the pay they receive will little more than cover their actual expenses of training and equipment. So it is no more than just, and I think it is no more than proper encouragement to these civilian components, that they receive as liberal treatment as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGINEERING

For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats, distilling and refrigerating apparatus; repairs, preservation, and renewals of electric interior and exterior signal communications and all electrical appliances of whatsoever nature on board naval vessels, except range finders, battle order and range transmitters and indicators, and motors and their controlling apparatus used to operate machinery belonging to other bureaus; searchlights and fire-control equipments for anti-aircraft defense at shore stations; maintenance and operation of coast signal service; equipment, supplies, and materials under the cognizance of the Bureau required for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels, yard craft, and ships' boats; purchase, installation, repair, and preservation of machinery, tools, and appliances in navy yards and stations, accident prevention, pay of classified field force under the Bureau; incidental expenses for

naval vessels, navy yards, and stations, inspectors' offices, the engineering experiment station, such as photographing, technical books and periodicals, stationery, and instruments; services, instruments, machines and auxiliaries, apparatus, and supplies, and technical books and periodicals necessary to carry on experimental and research work; maintenance and equipment of buildings and grounds at the engineering experiment station, Annapolis, Md.; payment of part time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed; in all, \$15,564,127: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,575,000.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Islands?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs this morning met and deliberated on the problem of independence for the Philippines. A decisive action was taken. It consists of extending the time of the Philippine Independence Act (Public, No. 311, 72d Cong.) to October 17, 1934. This important action and the historic announcement of the distinguished chairman, Senator TYDINGS, constitute a triumph of democracy within the meaning of the highest traditions of the American people. They signify, too, a victory for the Filipino people. They are a recognition of the Filipino people's right to determine their fate and liberty, their independence and destiny.

On January 15, 1934, on the very floor of Congress, I rose, pleading for an extension of time by about 9 months, which will be up to October 17. Having asked for this extension of time, in the absence of a definite proposal from the Quezon Mission, in face of the danger of not having any kind of Philippine independence legislation, I am naturally pleased with the action taken by the Senate committee. I feel that it will be welcome news to the preponderant majority of the Filipino people.

I might add that the decision of the Senate committee is in conformity with the views of over two thirds of the Members of the Seventy-second Congress that approved the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law on January 17, 1933, and with the present temper of the Seventy-third Congress. It also accords with the report of the Ninth Philippine Independence Commission headed by Messrs. Osmeña and Roxas, who unanimously recommended acceptance of the Independence Act or the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law, emphasizing that such action would not jeopardize the rights of the Filipino people subsequently to petition Congress for desired and desirable modifications.

The Senate committee's decision to extend the time of the law by 9 months is a fundamental proposal demanding solidarity of sentiment and unity of action. It is a way out of the present dilemma and a means to achieve the freedom and independence of the Philippines.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point the statement of Senator TYDINGS for the Senate committee on the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands?

There was no objection.

Senator TYDINGS' statement follows:

At the meeting of the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee this morning (January 23), the question of independence for the Philippine Islands was discussed and the following action taken:

1. That there will be no new Philippine legislation in reference to ultimate independence at this session of Congress. However, it was the sense of the committee that the Hawes-Cutting bill would be amended in one particular only and that is to extend the time of the bill which was January 17, 1934, when the Philippine Legislature must move to carry out its provisions to October 17, 1934, and that no other changes in the Hawes-Cutting bill will be considered.

2. Under the Hawes-Cutting bill passed last year the Philippine Legislature was required if it desired independence to take action prior to January 17, 1934. This the legislature refused to

do one way or the other and consequently the Philippine people have had no opportunity to accept or reject the Hawes-Cutting bill.

3. As the elections to the Philippine Legislature are to be held this coming June, and as the last legislature did not act on the Hawes-Cutting bill at all, it was the sense of the committee that an extension of time to give the new legislature a chance on it was fair and the only action the committee would take to alter or consider alterations to the general subject matter.

4. Therefore, it is the committee's desire to give the Filipinos one more chance to accept or reject the Hawes-Cutting bill, if after the new elections the legislature again fails to take action or acts adversely upon the provisions of the Hawes-Cutting bill, it will be notice to Congress that the people of the Philippines do not desire independence and desire to continue with their present status.

5. It is the overwhelming opinion of Congress that the Hawes-Cutting bill is the fairest bill to both nations which can be passed and if the Filipino people do not want it, no better bill can be written and passed.

6. It should be recalled that President Roosevelt in his last campaign on two occasions stated he favored the Hawes-Cutting bill and that this statement of the President makes the above observations complete as far as the two branches of Congress dealing with it have to do.

Mr. OSIAS. Senator TYDINGS said the committee's action was final, and that it placed determination of their destiny squarely before the Philippine people.

Congress retains an open mind about modification of the Hawes-Cutting bill at some future period—

He declared—

however, we must first know if the Filipinos want independence. Perhaps in a few years it will be found some of the provisions of the bill are unfair either to the Philippines or to the United States; in that case Congress would have no objection to consider the objections, with a possibility of modifying the measure if it was deemed advisable.

Mr. TYDINGS, in announcing the committee's action, said it emphatically represented his personal views as well.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of naval personnel: For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders (not to exceed 908 officers of the Medical Corps, 186 officers of the Dental Corps, 556 officers of the Supply Corps, 83 officers of the Chaplain Corps, 233 officers of the Construction Corps, 109 officers of the Civil Engineer Corps, and 1,461 warrant and commissioned warrant officers: *Provided*, That if the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers and officers in any staff corps holding commission on July 1, 1934, is in excess of the number herein stipulated, such excess officers may be retained in the Navy until the number is reduced to the limitations imposed by this act), pay, \$27,515,049, including not to exceed \$1,170,297 (none of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by more than 8 nonflying officers or observers, to be selected by the Secretary of the Navy) for increased pay for making aerial flights; rental allowance, \$5,589,216; subsistence allowance, \$3,511,677; in all, \$36,615,942; officers on the retired list, \$6,003,774; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$3,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$4,631,886; interest on deposits by men, \$3,000; pay of petty officers (not to exceed an average of 6,760 chief petty officers, of which number those with a permanent appointment as chief petty officer shall not exceed an average of 5,910), seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, extra pay for men for diving, and cash prizes (not to exceed \$75,000) for men for excellence in gunnery, target practice, and engineering competitions, \$60,611,606, and, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to make transfers during the fiscal year 1935 from the clothing and small stores fund to this appropriation of sums aggregating not to exceed \$2,000,000; outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment, civilian clothing not to exceed \$15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct or undesirability or inaptitude, reimbursement in kind of clothing to persons in the Navy for losses in cases of marine or aircraft disasters or in the operation of water- or air-borne craft, and the authorized issue of clothing and equipment to the members of the Nurse Corps, \$878,194; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, \$57,960, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; pay and allowances of the Nurse Corps, including assistant superintendents, directors and assistant directors—pay, \$402,272; rental allowance, \$15,552; subsistence allowance, \$14,191; pay retired list, \$121,361; in all, \$553,376; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps; pay and allowances of transferred and assigned men of the Fleet Naval

Reserve, \$10,573,590; reimbursement for losses of property as provided in the act approved October 6, 1917 (U.S.C., title 34, secs. 981, 982), as amended by the act of March 3, 1927 (U.S.C., Supp. VI, title 34, sec. 983), \$5,000; payment of 6 months' death gratuity, \$90,000; in all, \$120,027,328, and no part of such sum shall be available to pay active-duty pay and allowances to officers in excess of four on the retired list, except retired officers temporarily ordered to active duty as members of retiring and selection boards as authorized by law: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, no officer of the Navy shall be entitled to receive an addition to his pay in consequence of the provisions of the act approved May 13, 1908 (U.S.C., title 34, sec. 867): *Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or other expenses of any enlisted man or civil employee performing service in the residence or quarters of an officer or officers on shore as a cook, waiter, or other work of a character performed by a household servant, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Naval Reserve without additional expense to the Government;

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chairman.

Is this the section that carries the limitation on the number of officers and enlisted men of the Navy?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. GOSS. I recall that last year in the hearings it was developed that some 5,000 marines were assigned to able-bodied seaman duty with the Navy. How many are on such duty now because we do not have enough sailors to man our ships?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I do not recall the number, but I do not think any appreciable change has occurred since last year. I have not the figures right at hand, but my recollection is the number is about the same as it was last year.

Mr. GOSS. So that we still have to call upon some 5,000 marines to do able-bodied seamen's duty on our battleships, cruisers, and so on.

We are proceeding with a new program of naval construction, and it will be further extended by the bill reported out by the Naval Affairs Committee. How many officers and men will we be short of meeting that construction program with the language of limitation contained in this section?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. That all depends upon the policy to be adopted as to the number of ships to be kept in active commission and the extent to which we are willing to raise the present complements. For the present, I do not believe we will be short any men. This bill contemplates that the enlisted personnel will be raised to 82,500. In other words, the appropriation provides for 82,500 enlisted men by the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. GOSS. I would like to call attention particularly to the proviso contained in lines 7 to 12 on page 21:

Provided, That if the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers and officers in any Staff Corps holding commission on July 1, 1934, is in excess of the number herein stipulated, such excess officers may be retained in the Navy until the number is reduced to the limitations imposed by this act.

Now, it is apparent from the language of the bill that we are imposing certain limitations in this act on the number of personnel, not only of warrant officers and enlisted men, but also of officers. If, as the gentleman says, we have some 5,000 marines doing able-bodied seamen's duty, should not the limitations be removed, or have other limitations been put on the number of officers and sailors necessary to man our warships?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The limitation appearing on pages 20 and 21 is entirely with reference to staff officers, that is officers of the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Supply Corps, and so forth.

Mr. GOSS. This proviso mentions warrant, and commissioned warrant officers, and officers. It is not limited to the staff.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but the limitation in the bill is applicable only to staff officers.

Mr. GOSS. What are we going to do when these new ships are put into commission? I ask the chairman where are we going to find these officers and enlisted men?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. The construction to which the gentleman refers is all replacement construction. However, we have a surplus of officers at the present time, I may say to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GOSS. Even with 200 line officers on duty with the C.C.C.?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. And with the two-hundred and odd medical officers on duty with the C.C.C.?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Yes; we still have a surplus.

Mr. GOSS. So the gentleman thinks the Navy is overmanned with officer personnel?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I do. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. GOSS. How much is it overmanned?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I should say several hundred.

Mr. GOSS. But we have 400 with the C.C.C. organizations. The gentleman is not overlooking them, is he?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. No.

Mr. GOSS. What I am trying to find out is whether we will have a sufficient personnel to man these new ships.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. We are overly supplied at this particular time. I see no occasion to be alarmed about future requirements. They will be available, I am sure, if and when needed.

Mr. GOSS. What about the enlisted personnel? It seems a crime to have to take enlisted men of the Marine Corps, men especially trained, devil dogs, as they have been called, to do ordinary seamen's duty.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. As the gentleman well knows, there is nothing unusual about that. Marines aboard ship have always been assigned battle stations.

Mr. GOSS. But they are supposed to be doing Marine Corps duty rather than able-bodied seamen's duty.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. They have always performed naval duties in addition to their duties as marines.

Mr. GOSS. If we got into a scrap would we have enough men to man our ships?

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I am sure the gentleman understands that it has never been the policy to maintain full complements in times of peace.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Subsistence of naval personnel: For provisions and commuted rations for enlisted men of the Navy, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes in case of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officers, at 50 cents per diem, and midshipmen at 75 cents per diem, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited at the rate of 66 cents per ration to the naval hospital fund; subsistence of men unavoidably detained or absent from vessels to which attached under orders (during which subsistence rations to be stopped on board ship and no credit for commutation therefor to be given); quarters and subsistence of men on detached duty; subsistence of members of the Naval Reserve during period of active service; subsistence in kind at hospitals and on board ship in lieu of subsistence allowance of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement; in all, \$13,408,072.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to a certain situation. This relates not only to the particular item that has just been read, but also relates to the entire supply features of the bill. This appears on page 200 of the hearings on the bill. This bill was gotten up on the basis of prices back in the fiscal year 1933, as I understand it.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I think the gentleman is in error. I think it is based upon prices obtaining in 1932.

Mr. TABER. Nineteen hundred and thirty-three, I said. The gentleman from Connecticut here suggests 1932, but I did not.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. I say 1932 also; late in 1932.

Mr. TABER. Late in 1932; all right. At the present time if we were to go into the market to buy these supplies, the

Department tells us we would have to pay from 20 to 25 percent additional, and if we were to go ahead and operate on the basis of present prices, we would have to have from 13 to 15 million dollars more money. That situation means just this, either prices are going to collapse and go down to where they were a year or a year and a half ago, or else we are going to have to pass a deficiency appropriation in order to meet this situation. I am not going to offer an amendment to meet this situation, but I think the House and the country should know as we approach consideration of these different items what is in store for them later on.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

AVIATION, NAVY

For aviation, as follows: For navigational, photographic, aerological, radio, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1934, \$672,152; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, air stations, fleet air bases, fleet and all other aviation activities, accident prevention, testing laboratories, for overhauling of planes, and for the purchase for aviation purposes only of special clothing, wearing apparel, and special equipment, \$10,066,800, including \$120,000 for the equipment of vessels with catapults and including not to exceed \$100,000 for the procurement of helium, and such sum shall be transferred to and made available to the Bureau of Mines on July 1, 1934, in addition to which sum the Bureau of Mines may use for helium-plant operation in the fiscal year 1934 the unexpended balance of funds transferred to it for such operation in the fiscal year 1933, and the Bureau may lease, after competition, surplus metal cylinders acquired for use as helium containers; for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft, including the payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed, \$1,773,368; for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories, \$6,131,000, of which amount not to exceed \$2,400,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorization carried in the Navy Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1934; in all, \$18,643,320; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "aviation" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$971,200: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Navy may, prior to July 1, 1936, enter into contracts for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories, to an amount not in excess of \$2,800,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, to transfer not to exceed in the aggregate \$24,000 from this appropriation to the appropriations "pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", and "pay, Marine Corps" to cover authorized traveling expenses of officers and enlisted men in connection with flying new airplanes from contractor's works to assigned station or ship, including travel to contractor's works and return of personnel to station of duty, and the amount so transferred shall be in addition to any limitations contained in the appropriations "pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", and "pay, Marine Corps": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coast of the continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft, where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$500.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On pages 35 and 36, after the comma in line 23, page 35, strike out all of the matter down to the word "and", in line 2, page 36.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this clause, which appears in the 1934 appropriation act, was left in the print inadvertently. It is perfectly obvious it will be ineffective as to next year and should be omitted.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JONES: Page 35, line 22, strike out the words "and such sum" and insert in lieu thereof "which sum of \$100,000."

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read down to and including line 13, page 46.

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7199, the naval appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—MAINTENANCE OF CREDIT OF THE UNITED STATES (H.DOC. NO. 224)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 20, title I, of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, I am transmitting herewith certified copies of the following Executive orders, which were approved by me on January 19, 1934:

Executive Order No. 6565 (Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (c)).

Executive Order No. 6566 (Veterans' Regulation No. 6 (b)).

Executive Order No. 6567 (Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (b)).

Executive Order No. 6568 (Veterans' Regulation No. 10 (c)).

Executive Order No. 6565 amends Executive Orders No. 6156, June 6, 1933, and No. 6229, July 28, 1933.

Executive Order No. 6566 amends Executive Order No. 6232, July 28, 1933.

Executive Order No. 6567 amends Executive Order No. 6158, June 6, 1933.

Executive Order No. 6568 amends Executive Orders No. 6098, March 31, 1933, and No. 6234, July 28, 1933.

These veterans' regulations were issued in accordance with the terms of title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1934.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6670) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a corporation to aid in the refinancing of farm debts, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. GLASS, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, and Mr. TOWNSEND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS

The SPEAKER announced the following appointments:

Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; Mr. BOLAND, of Pennsylvania; Mr. CADY, of Michigan; Mr. FREAR, of Wisconsin; Mr. CARTER, of Wyoming.

Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, supplement VI, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. McREYNOLDS, of Tennessee; Mr. BOLTON, of Ohio.

Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. DOXEY, of Mississippi; Mr. WOODRUFF, of Michigan.

Pursuant to the provision of title 24, section 236, United States Code, the Chair appoints as Directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, of New York; Mr. FOCHT, of Pennsylvania.

Pursuant to the provision of title 20, section 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, of Maryland; Mr. CRUMP, of Tennessee; Mr. GIFFORD, of Massachusetts.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and move its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 234

Resolved, That CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committees on Military Affairs and World War Veterans' Legislation;

That CHARLES D. MILLARD, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on Elections No. 2.

The resolution was agreed to.

FOREIGN MARKET FOR AMERICAN COTTON

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter from Hon. William Murphey, president of the Citizens and Southern National Bank of Savannah, Ga., and an editorial from the Savannah Morning News, with reference to providing foreign markets for the disposition of American cotton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE CITIZENS AND SOUTHERN NATIONAL BANK,
Savannah, Ga., January 19, 1934.

HON. HOMER C. PARKER,
Congressman First District of Georgia,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR HOMER: I have been reading in the papers every day of different proposals made to the Congress of the United States concerning the control of cotton production in this country, and I am forced to write this letter to ask if anyone is giving any consideration whatever to the foreign market for our cotton.

Normally the South produces about 15,000,000 bales of cotton annually. The production, buying and selling, financing, and distribution of this cotton give occupation to approximately 2,000,000 farm families, to the railroads, boat and ship lines, gins, compresses, warehouses, port facilities, merchants and bankers, and to several million workers. American mills consume about 6,000,000 bales. The exported balance normally brings between four and six hundred million dollars annually to the South to feed lifeblood into all of its economic enterprises. This is new wealth created and obtained.

If we are to abandon our foreign market for cotton and then solve the surplus problem only by reducing again and again the quantity produced, not only will economic collapse result in the South but several million workers now employed in the South will be turned loose to seek jobs elsewhere in competition with other labor.

I hope that the Members of Congress for the cotton-producing States will get together and insist that instead of ruining our basic crop production and abandoning our outside markets to the other nations of the world that we take steps to broaden our market and bring into the South this new wealth which is so much needed.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM MURPHEY.

[From the Savannah Morning News, Jan. 22, 1934]

BUILD FOREIGN COTTON MARKET

Considerable thought to the problem of increasing the foreign market for American cotton has been given by William Murphey, president of the Citizens and Southern National Bank, as evidenced by his recent communication to Senator WALTER F. GEORGE and Congressman HOMER C. PARKER, inquiring whether anyone is giving any consideration whatever to the foreign market for our cotton.

The conclusion drawn from his letter is that, instead of concentrating entirely on crop reduction as a panacea for the surplus-

cotton problem, attention should be directed to means of stimulating world demand for cotton. He sees grave danger of economic collapse in the South if we are to abandon our foreign market for cotton, and then solve the surplus problem only by reducing again and again the quantity produced and turning loose several million workers to seek jobs elsewhere in competition with other labor.

Mr. Murphey's reasoning convincingly demonstrates that the problem is being tackled at the wrong end and that, instead of curtailing production, intensive study should be directed to promoting exportation to other countries. If a merchant finds he has too large a stock of goods on hand, he does not start chucking part of it into the furnace, but turns his thoughts to creating a greater demand and increasing the number of his customers. It seems logical that Uncle Sam should pursue a similar policy in connection with his surplus cotton. As pointed out by Mr. Murphey, the South normally produces about 15,000,000 bales of cotton annually. American mills consume about 6,000,000 bales. The exported balance normally brings between four and six hundred million dollars annually to the South. It behooves the South, therefore, to safeguard and broaden its market for cotton, since far less than half of the cotton produced is consumed in our own country.

Glancing back at the statistics at the close of the 1932-33 season on July 31, we find that England was Savannah's best customer during that year, having absorbed 145,830 bales. France took 3,080 bales and the remainder of the European continent divided 98,897 bales, while the Far East's buying of Savannah cotton, which the previous year had been Savannah's best customer, was limited to 17,597 bales.

An encouraging view of the situation was taken in the review of the 1932-33 season by the New York Cotton Exchange, the annual year book of which said: "While the expansion of the supply was being checked by reduced production in the United States, world consumption of cotton recorded a very great increase. The increase occurred entirely in American cotton, since many mills used American cotton in place of foreign growths because of the relative cheapness of the American staple. The total consumption of foreign cottons was a little less than that of the previous season. World consumption of American, together with a small amount destroyed, aggregated 14,435,000 bales, as against 12,568,000 the season before. World consumption of foreign cotton totaled 10,367,000 bales, as against 10,501,000 the season previous. Hence world consumption of all cottons was 24,802,000 bales, as compared with 23,069,000 in the previous season. The consumption of 24,802,000 was highly encouraging, considering the severe trade depression throughout the world and the fact that the normal consumption in pre-depression years was only 25,000,000 bales. In consequence of the reduced production and the increased consumption, the world all-cotton carry-over at the close of the 1932-33 season was only 16,247,000 bales as compared with 17,412,000 the year before."

THE HOUSE SURRENDERS THE CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION OF CONGRESS TO CONTROL AND REGULATE MONEY

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, including some editorials, which I quote therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, in its hasty, ill-considered deliberation on the far-reaching monetary bill, which passed the House Saturday, brought severe criticism upon itself. This criticism against the House is not only because it passed the bill but the manner in which it passed it. The leadership in control of the House refused to permit the committee in charge of the bill to have any reasonable time to consider the bill. Then, when the bill was brought upon the floor Saturday, the House did not conduct itself as a serious deliberative body. It is such conduct as this which leads the people to lose confidence in representative government.

There was no occasion for the House to conduct itself as it did. The leadership of this House had fair warning that the committee in charge of this bill wanted time to study the contents of the bill and to hear expert witnesses upon the bill.

Let us review the record on that subject. In the proceedings of the House on January 18, Mr. BYRNS, majority leader, undertook to obtain the unanimous consent to start the program to railroad this bill through the House. Mr. SNELL, the minority leader, appealed to him and to the House to give the committee in charge of this bill sufficient time to consider it. Let me quote from the words of Mr. SNELL, on page 880 of the RECORD of January 18:

I may say to the majority leader, considering the importance of the bill and how vitally it affects not only the present generation but several generations to come, it seems to me that the

Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures has not yet had sufficient time to secure the information that should have been given to the committee and, in my judgment, is absolutely necessary before we pass on such an important measure.

Mr. McFADDEN, of Pennsylvania, in column 1, page 882, in the RECORD of the 18th, offered the objection which denied unanimous consent. Under the rules of the House, this denial of unanimous consent for the request of the majority leader, Mr. BYRNS, could only stay the matter for 24 hours. Immediately after Mr. McFADDEN offered this objection, the Rules Committee was called together and began to prepare a rule which could be presented the next day to bring this bill up for immediate consideration. Thereupon the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures went into immediate session. The committee wanted a longer time. The committee instructed the Chairman of the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee to appeal to the Rules Committee, at least, to give the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee until Monday to consider the bill. The chairman, Mr. SOMERS, made such an appeal to the Rules Committee. It was in vain. The Rules Committee insisted upon bringing the bill up for final consideration Saturday.

The minority members of the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee wanted to bring in witnesses whose knowledge of this subject is unquestioned. Among the witnesses who would have been called were Newton D. Baker, a former Democratic Secretary of War; Mr. Houston, a former Democratic Secretary of the Treasury; prominent economists associated with some of the leading universities of America; and outstanding men in American finance. Of this list of witnesses there was not a single one to whom any partisan bias or prejudice against the bill could possibly be credited. We, in the minority, in presenting these names, refrained from calling in any prominent Republicans, who might also be students of finance. We did this because we sincerely wanted light and advice on this bill, and we did not want anyone to be able even to point the finger of partisan suspicion toward any witness who might appear before the committee. We could not have the witnesses because the Democratic leaders in control of the House, thereby in control of the Rules Committee, would not permit us to have sufficient time to deliberate over this bill.

Warning was not only given to the leadership of the House that time should be given for the consideration of this bill from the Republican Members of the House, but a similar warning came from the Democratic press of this country. In this connection, I wish to quote an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 20, a Democratic paper which supported Mr. Roosevelt in the campaign and has been and is now one of the outstanding Democratic papers in the country. I quote:

LOOK BEFORE YOU LEAP

One of the most encouraging signs appearing on the legislative horizon since Congress met is the disinclination of a few Members of the House and Senate to be stampeded into immediate acceptance of the President's recommendations for a new monetary policy. If the only question involved were the question of dollar devaluation the case for a thorough scrutiny of the monetary program might not be so impressive. Devaluation, as Roy A. Young, governor of the Boston Federal Reserve Bank, told the Senate committee yesterday, is an accomplished fact in general, although the precise rate remains to be determined. And it would be supererogatory to make too much of a fuss over water that is already over the dam.

But there are a great many other things that are involved in the bill the administration is asking Congress to pass by Tuesday. Some of the sections, as Mr. Young said, commit us permanently to an irredeemable currency. Adoption of those sections would mean not a simple change in the gold value of our currency but a complete reversal of the whole theory upon which our monetary system has been built up. Members of Congress who want to know what it is all about before making a commitment of such tremendous consequence are showing a commendable sense of their legislative responsibilities.

Nor is the reversal of our monetary policy the only issue on which more light is needed before final action on the monetary program. The bill embodying the President's recommendations covers a great variety of things. It proposes to vest in the Secretary of the Treasury alone a perpetual authority over the \$2,000,000,000 stabilization fund to be created from the paper profits of dollar devaluation. It proposes to ratify and confirm everything

the President and his advisers have done under the Emergency Banking Act and the Thomas Inflation amendment to the Farm Relief Act. Congress, as Representative McGUIN of Kansas said in the House on Thursday, cannot vote intelligently on these matters without some time for study and examination.

Mr. McGUIN might have added to his catalog of questions on which time for study is necessary the proposed reforms in the system of issuing bonds and short-term securities which Secretary Morgenthau has asked to have tacked on to the monetary bill. Mr. Morgenthau's request, submitted at the eleventh hour, envisages an authorization for the increase of the short-term debt from \$7,500,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000. Under the same program the Secretary of the Treasury would also be empowered to offer long-term securities to the banks without advertising for public subscriptions. These are changes of policy potentially far-reaching in their implications.

It may be that the changes can be shown to be desirable. But it is to be remembered that our short-term debt is already unwieldy and that its increase by one third would add materially to the weight of the problem of refinancing that hangs over the Treasury. It is to be remembered further that the banks are already loaded up on Federal securities and that to authorize the Treasury to issue a banking loan of the proportions envisaged in the recent Budget message might create a situation in which one half of the banking resources of the country would be tied up in Government bonds. Congress ought to know whether this is good banking and good public financing before accepting such a proposal.

With the desire of the administration to expedite the consideration of the monetary program it is easy to sympathize up to a certain point. Current monetary uncertainties are interfering with Government financing and with the operations of private business. It is important to end them at the earliest practicable moment. But the need for monetary certainty is not so great as to override all the ordinary precautions of representative government. Congress ought at least to look before it leaps.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, on page 881, as a minority member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, which was considering this bill, I made the following statement in the House and directly to Mr. BYRNS, majority leader:

If the House will give the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures an opportunity to proceed in an orderly manner, as every other committee has had the opportunity to do, it will report this bill promptly. I think the committee should have the opportunity of holding not to exceed 2 days of legitimate hearings. If we cannot have this, of course, we shall have to bring the bill in without any consideration.

In the face of appeals for a reasonable time to consider this bill from both Republican and Democratic members of the committee, and from the minority leader, Mr. SNELL, and from the Democratic press, the Democratic leadership of the House, through its control of the Rules Committee, forced this bill into the House for consideration on Saturday before the committee or the general Membership of the House had had a reasonable opportunity to consider this important and far-reaching legislation. Then, laying the party lash upon an overwhelming majority, the bill was forced through the House on Saturday. Not only did this majority force this bill through the House, trampling under foot every amendment offered, but did so with little or no consideration of the merits or demerits of the amendments. The House not only overrode these amendments without reasonable consideration of the contents of the bill or merits of the amendments, but conducted itself in a manner wholly unbecoming of a legislative body. I call your attention to an editorial comment from this outstanding Democratic paper, the Baltimore Sun. I quote an editorial from the Sun of Monday, January 22, which pertains to the conduct of the House in the consideration of this bill:

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

In passing the gold reserve bill, the House of Representatives acted more like a boss-controlled party convention than a serious legislative assemblage. Here was a measure which proposed not only to devalue the dollar but also to reverse the whole direction of our monetary policy. It was a bill which in the opinion of not a few informed students of banking proposed to nullify the theory of the Federal Reserve Act and to invest a single public official with power to manage in perpetuity a fund of \$2,000,000,000 set up for the express purpose of jiggling the money markets.

Yet the House adopted it as a national convention might adopt a platform couched in meaningless platitude. The bill had been rushed through committee without adequate hearings, chiefly because the committee which handled it wanted to get ahead of another committee bursting with ambition to consider it. It came to the floor in such questionable form that the very chairman of the group reporting it announced that after its passage he was "going

to call his committee together to study ways to perfect it." The debate on the floor was dull and perfunctory, and was limited to 3 hours on the bill itself, with an additional hour on the gage rule under which the bill was forced to an immediate passage. The only amendment to arouse the slightest interest was a silly proposal by Representative PATMAN prohibiting the use of exported gold to aid the Bank for International Settlements or to assist any foreign institution.

The vote of 359 to 40 by which the bill was adopted at the end of this travesty was the sort of verdict which a mob of super-heated delegates might be expected to register on orders from a group of bosses in a smoke-filled room. It was not the sort of thing to be expected from a body of seriously intentioned legislators desirous of directing their action to the ends of national welfare. This is not to say that the bill for which the House fell over itself to vote is undesirable or that, with certain perfecting amendments to which Chairman SOMERS, of the Coinage Committee, may or may not have been referring, it is not adapted to the purposes of the moment.

The point is that neither the committee nor the Members of the House had any opportunity to satisfy themselves on this point. They simply took a leap in the dark of monetary experimentation because the White House cracked the whip. The Members of the House, which is supposed to be the great popular branch of the National Legislature, left the real responsibilities of a popular assemblage up to the Senate. We have heard a great deal in recent months about the delegation of legislative power. The manner in which the House passed the buck to the Senate on a measure as momentous as any to come before a momentous Congress is one of the supreme acts of delegation in our national history.

If we are to go into this monetary experiment with our legislative eyes open, it is now up to the Senate to open them. The Senate Banking Committee has started out very well. It has inaugurated a series of hearings at which the pros and cons of the President's program are being discussed in orderly and measured fashion. Should the committee and the Senate carry on in the same tempo and on the same level, Senators and citizens as well may know more about this thing before its inevitable adoption. To this illumination of a difficult question, neither the administration nor its fondest supporters can reasonably object. If the President's program is as well prepared to stand the test of experience as they say, it ought to be able to stand the test of a few days' debate in a Congress which the administration controls.

If it is fit to challenge the verdict of history, it ought at least to be able to challenge a little legislative illumination.

The bill has been passed by the House. Now, if parliamentary government in America is to retain reasonable public respect, the Congress must depend upon the Senate. In support of this statement I offer an editorial from another great Democratic paper, which was most friendly to Mr. Roosevelt in his campaign and is now friendly to his administration. That paper is the New York Times. Following is the editorial in the New York Times of January 23:

HOW NOT TO LEGISLATE

The full report of the proceedings of the House of Representatives on Saturday, January 20, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD presents an extraordinary picture of legislative hurry and confusion. The business was consideration of the President's monetary bill. Of it two different prints were in the hands of Members. They did not agree in either pagination or phraseology. Many sincere efforts were made by Representatives like Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York, Mr. LUKE, of Massachusetts, and Mr. BEEDY, of Maine, to elicit from the Democrats in charge of the measure explanations of some of its ambiguous clauses. All was in vain. The time was too short or knowledge was lacking. When debate was cut off and the bill was about to pass, Mr. BEEDY stated: "I do not think there are 10 Members in this House who can go back to their constituents and intelligently explain the provisions of the bill."

Along the same trend of thought I present an editorial from another newspaper, the Philadelphia Inquirer:

IT IS UP TO THE SENATE

In rushing the administration gold bill to passage late Saturday the House did exactly as it had been expected to do. Debate had been limited to 3 hours, but was extended to more than 7 hours by discussion of amendments. However, in view of the sketchy treatment which the highly important legislation was accorded by House committees, the debate on the floor could hardly be called thorough and exhaustive.

While the House was sweeping the bill through, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee was hearing additional vigorous opposition to the measure from prominent financial advisers. And in the volcanic debate in the House enough opposing views of the Republican minority were aired to bring from Representative BEEDY, Maine Republican, the remark that anyone who could vote for the measure after the proceedings "has an elastic conscience and an india-rubber brain."

While the 360 to 40 vote in the House forecasts an administration victory in the Senate, there should be on the Senate floor a wide and thorough discussion of a proposal which goes beyond the emergency measures of the Roosevelt recovery program and

into a permanent financial policy, as yet untried, centralizing tremendous power in the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Nation realizes as well as Congress that the President should have strong support in his emergency measures to rout the forces of depression. But on questions of permanent monetary policy, bearing tremendous possibilities for the country's financial future, there should be a stop, look, consider warning posted in the Senate.

Among the things which the House did in its turbulent conduct was to defeat an amendment which would have made section 10 legislation to meet an emergency instead of permanent legislation. In doing so there was taken away from Congress and placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury permanent control over money. The House did this notwithstanding the fact that the Constitution vests in the Congress and the Congress alone the power to control and regulate the value of money. When the House did this it had fair warning of what it was doing. I offered an amendment which would have made this power temporary instead of permanent. Also by this amendment during this temporary period the power would have been vested in a board of five composed of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, and two other members to be appointed by the President. I tried as best I could to give the House fair warning as to what it was doing by passing this bill with section 10 as it was in the bill without any amendment. In column 1, page 979, in discussing this subject, I said:

This bill seeks to turn over the full control of the power of money into the hands of one man, the Secretary of the Treasury, not only this Secretary of the Treasury but all Secretaries of the Treasury which may come after him. The framers of the Constitution in their wisdom placed, not in the President of the United States, but in the Congress the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. When we provide a \$2,000,000,000 fund for the Secretary of the Treasury to use to beat up or down American money, to beat up or down the currency of every other country, we have placed in the hands of one man the economic destiny of 126,000,000 American people. In doing so we have betrayed our constitutional obligation to retain in the hands of Congress the power to control money.

The House not only had these statements from me but it also had the following statement from an outstanding authority, the Committee for the Nation, before it on two different occasions, once in column 1, page 968, of the RECORD of January 20, and another time in column 1, page 1004. I quote from the Committee for the Nation:

Regulating the purchasing power of our United States money imposed as a duty by the Constitution upon the Congress is the highest act of sovereignty. Permanent relinquishment of this function by Congress to one Cabinet member is so momentous a step that it should have full discussion before being taken.

However, the House was in no frame of mind to pay any regard to its constitutional obligations. The crowd was in action. The merciless power of organization votes was controlling the proceedings of the day.

The conduct of the House in giving over this control of money to the Secretary of the Treasury and deserting its own constitutional obligations has brought upon it the unanimous criticism of the leaders of all shades of monetary reform. Among those who have insisted that the wrong done by the House must be corrected by the Senate are Frank Vanderlip, Committee for the Nation, Owen D. Young, Walter Lippmann, Rev. Charles Coughlin, Dr. Edwin W. Kemmerer, Dr. H. Parker Willis, and James P. Warburg.

In fact, there seems to be few if any who favor this surrender of Congress of its constitutional obligation except him, whoever he may be, who prepared the original draft of this bill, and the majority Membership which drove it through the House with section 10 in its original form. Even those who drove it through the House do not defend this surrender of Congress of its constitutional obligation over the control of money on any ground of righteousness or wisdom. The defense offered by the majority in the House for its conduct in this matter is party loyalty. Certainly this is a poor excuse for Congress to surrender its constitutional functions. Party loyalty or party cooperation is highly essential and highly desired in an emergency but

I submit that it cannot justify congressional betrayal of a constitutional obligation upon Congress.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE COMPENSATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. BROWN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. BROWN]:

I am speaking tonight under the auspices and by the courtesy of the National Old Age Pension Association, headed by Dr. J. E. Pope, who has given much valuable time and service to this worthy cause. It is the purpose of the National Old Age Pension Association to foster legislation which will provide, in a meager way, for those persons past the age of 65, who are unable to take care of themselves, and to care for those between the ages of 40 and 65 who, by reason of physical or mental inability, cannot earn a livelihood.

In the mind of the average business man or woman, the first question asked will undoubtedly be the cost of such pension laws. May I at this time set your minds at ease as to any additional cost over and above that now entailed by our present poorhouse system.

The Bureau of Labor statistics has stated that, in the poorhouses of America, the average cost of caring for an inmate is \$336 per year. For approximately this same sum, we can give relief to dependent old age from the horror of being compelled to accept degrading shelter in pauper institutions. It is not necessary to argue, in this age of realization of social responsibility, that it would be better to pay a direct pension to the aged than to force them into the humiliation of accepting their livelihood in poorhouses, especially when the cost is not appreciably different.

There may be those who will argue that such laws will put a penalty on thrift and will encourage shiftlessness and lack of foresight by removing the incentive for saving. This argument has no basis of fact, especially in an age of economic maladjustment which has thrown into the breadline approximately one third of the population of this country. We have just emerged from an age of rugged individualism, an age that has accepted no responsibility for the welfare of others but has lauded and cheered those who could carve out fortunes for themselves regardless of the manner or means used in piling up their millions. The heroes of the past have been masters of finance who could reach out into the public income and grab off from the earnings of others multiplied millions for themselves. To such extremes did we go in the direction of rugged individualism that, in the year 1928, we had in this country 43,184 millionaires, and in the same year we witnessed the beginning of the greatest bread line in the history of our country, for in that year we had approximately 3,000,000 unemployed men. The bread line grew until one third of the population of our country was dependent upon charity or the Government for their livelihood. I would not want to belittle wealth or the accumulation of wealth. I am inclined to agree with the old farmer who, hearing many people speak of tainted money, remarked to his wife that "the trouble with tainted money, Martha, is 'taint ours.'" However, recognizing the property rights of American citizenship and their right to store up this world's goods for themselves, we must recognize another fundamental principle of government, and that is this: That a government's primary obligation is to take care of that portion of its citizenship which is unable by circumstances or surroundings to take care of itself.

I lay this down as a fundamental tenet in every form of successful government, that any government which fails to see to it that the lowliest of its citizenship has at least an opportunity for the minimum benefits of life has failed in its first and last duty as a government. You can trace the history of governments as far back as the human mind has ever recorded, and you will find no exception to this rule in the history of the lives of governments. Indeed, the first government known to the human mind was the family, and it is a poor father who would allow one of his children to starve while he heaped an excess of necessities and luxuries on the others. The next government known was a combination of families, called a tribe, and it was a poor chieftan who would allow a portion of his tribe to starve; and if he allowed this condition to exist, it did not take the tribe long to depose him. When tribes became multiplied into cities and nations, the law did not change. Whenever a government failed to take care of the minimum needs and wants of its citizenship, the government ceased to exist. What reason is there for paying tribute in taxes or in loyalty to a government which recognizes no responsibility to its citizenship in distress? Multiply the families and tribes of the past until they become 48 great States, headed by a Government at Washington, D.C., and you have not repealed the primal law that government must take care of such portions of its citizenship as are unable by circumstances or surroundings to take care of themselves.

We are emerging now from that age of rugged individualism and embarking upon an era of social responsibility and coopera-

tion. This Nation has suffered through 12 years of governmental supervision which ignored the rights of the weak and heaped benefits into the arms of the strong. We have reached the anomalous position of a nation that has a surplus of everything imaginable and yet finds a third of its population thrown out into the cold and into the bread line by the inequalities of its economic system. We see the wisdom of Shakespeare's statement when he said, "They are as sick who surfeit with too much as they who starve with nothing." With the ability to produce in superabundance in every line of industry and in every trade or profession, we find from 12 to 15 million people in this country out of employment and most of them through no fault of their own. Thrifty people, who have spent a lifetime at their job, find themselves in the bread line and facing a bleak old age with no provision possible through their own efforts to support themselves. This is partially the result of maldistribution in our economic system and partially the result of the elimination of jobs through machine improvements. Over 900,000 positions have been eliminated in manufacturing establishments; 350,000 in railroad transportation service; and over 800,000 in agriculture, and yet, with this decreased labor force, every branch of industry and agriculture produces more than before the elimination of these workers.

Within the last 10 years, many thousand banks have failed; fortunes have been swept away on the tide of the depression on every hand, and those who now are on the verge of 60 find themselves dependents through forces over which they had no control. With more of everything than all the people can use, we still have those among our citizenship who argue that the Government owes no responsibility to see to it that the unemployed man has a job, that the sick have medical aid, that those in tender youth are protected from the greed of industry which would blight their youth, that the aged are taken from the poorhouses and the bread lines, and that, generally, we accept the social responsibility of citizenship in the sense of a community of interests where greed will not be allowed to run riot and leave in its wake as wreckage a great portion of the citizenship of our country.

The President of the United States has led the way for a school of political thought which recognizes, as a social responsibility of government, the duty to help solve these problems which now confront our Nation. He has said that the gain that this Nation will make will be made in the name of 120,000,000 people, and he did not leave out of consideration in this gain which he hoped for America a solitary portion of our citizenship. His program has taken care of the unemployed; it has offered relief to the needy; it has given a spur to industry; it has pumped life into the veins of agriculture; it has fostered labor as no administration in the history of our Nation; and I am sure that in that program there must be some place for the furrowed faces and limp hands of those who have toiled almost three score year and ten and find themselves now, by the shortsightedness of the economic system of which we are a part, left as wreckage of a machine age, to beg on the streets or live out the few remaining years of their lives in the squalid conditions usually existing in our poorhouses. It is said that education is the debt that the present owes to the future, and certainly it may truly be said that old-age pensions constitute the debt that the present owes to the past. Old-age pensions constitute the debt that the present generations owe now and always will owe to those persons now living who have contributed to the building of this country; and the way we can best pay that debt to the builders of America is to care for them when they no longer can care for themselves.

Through our workmen's compensation laws in the various States, we recognize that each separate portion of the human body has a definite value. We say by law that when industry causes a workman to lose his hand such industry must pay a definite sum for this loss. We say that an eye is worth a definite amount, that a foot and each toe thereon has a definite separate value. It is not logical and sensible that, if we recognize the value of each separate portion of the human body, we should also recognize that when industry has used up all the energy and all the ability of the human frame and casts out the useless hull, some provision should be made to take care of the used-up human body? In other words, if each separate portion of the human body has a value set by law, should not the whole human body, when exhausted and completely demolished insofar as service and ability to work are concerned, have some definite value placed thereon, and should not some provision be made for its care when it no longer can provide for itself?

Old-age pensions are not alone sponsored and favored by those who hope personally to profit, but they have been actively supported, first, by Franklin D. Roosevelt when, as Governor of New York, he signed the State's first old-age pension law, and even now the First Lady of the land is one of the foremost advocates of an old-age pension law for the District of Columbia. Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio; Governor Lehman, of New York; Arthur Brisbane, the famous editorial writer; and many other prominent individuals, who will not need support through this means, are fostering this legislation as a necessary step in a social program which recognizes the responsibility on the strong to provide minimum necessities for the unfortunate who can make no provision for themselves.

This is not a radical or socialistic departure from past practices of government. Indeed, Kaiser Wilhelm had old-age pension laws for Germany, and no one would accuse the Kaiser of being unduly socialistic. Forty-one foreign nations have old-age protection, in one form or another, on a national basis. In this country, we have

left the matter of old-age pensions to the States, which is a very unsatisfactory way of handling a social need. Twenty-six States of the Union have old-age pension laws, but in practically all of these States, the requisites of citizenship are from 10 to 15 years' residence, and in a land of shifting population this leaves a great portion of our old people unable to qualify for State relief. It is no more expensive to collect the money on a national basis and thus relieve the States of the expense of operating separate organizations for dispensing such relief. If you ask me where we shall get the money, of course, there is provision made under the plan of the National Old Age Pension Association for a small portion of the incomes of those who earn to go to this fund to take care of it, but the answer always to all calls for social relief can be made in this manner, that wherever social needs exist, money should be collected where the money is and spent where the need exists. This is a safe principle in schools and in any other form of governmental aid to its various branches of citizenship.

May I summarize my remarks by saying that old-age pensions cost less in dollars and cents than poorhouses; that a government owes a duty to every portion of its citizenship which is unable to take care of itself, regardless of the cause of the inability; that in one way or another we shall pay this debt; that as a portion of our great program of social reform and cooperative effort in advancing the interests of our Nation as a whole, we cannot forget those who toil and labor as long as energy is left and who find themselves without a sufficient portion of this world's goods to tide them over the span between the age of 65 and the grave. This is a responsibility which no unselfish man or woman would fail to recognize. We are meeting our obligations to other portions of our citizenship who by misfortune have been deprived of those things which contribute to the fullness of life, and, as a part of the program of the "new deal" with its motive to make life fuller for America's citizenship, is it not entirely proper that we should add a certainty of contentedness and security to the declining years of life by saying to the aged of America that "when your hands can no longer work and your mind is clouded with age, we who have grasped the torch which you have carried will see to it that you are provided in an honorable way with at least the necessities of life"?

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2284. An act relating to contracts and agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. AYRES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

(Wednesday, Jan. 24, 10:30 a.m.)

Hearings on H.R. 104.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Wednesday, Jan. 24, 10 a.m.)

Continuation of the hearing on H.R. 6836, to regulate motor carriers.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(Wednesday, Jan. 24, 10:30 a.m.)

Continuation of hearing on H.R. 6604.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Wednesday, Jan. 24, 10:30 a.m.)

Hearings on H.R. 4223 and H.R. 4368.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

304. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 17, 1934, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a preliminary examination of San Diego Harbor, Calif., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930 (H.Doc. 223); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

305. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting certified copies of various Executive orders amending certain veterans' regulations which were

issued in accordance with the terms of title 1, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government" (H.Doc. 224); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1517. A bill to provide for the use of net weights in interstate and foreign commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. GREENWAY: A bill (H.R. 7235) to authorize the sale of land on the Camp McDowell Indian Reservation to the city of Phoenix, Ariz., for use in connection with its water-supply development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7236) to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Big Dry Wash, in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7237) to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of Arizona for the use of the University of Arizona; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 7238) to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as "War Minerals Relief Statutes"; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. PEYSER: A bill (H.R. 7239) to amend the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD: A bill (H.R. 7240) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to adjust interest rates and maturities on obligations, arising under subsection (a) of section 201 of Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, held by it, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H.R. 7241) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the lands and property used for the United State Indian School at Genoa, Nebr., to the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H.R. 7242) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H.R. 7243) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 by adding after section 4 thereof a new section; and to authorize home-mortgage loans, and to appropriate the sum of \$500,000,000 therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H.R. 7244) amending the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7245) making income from United States securities subject to the income-tax laws of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H.R. 7246) to define and fix the standard of value and to regulate the coinage; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mrs. McCARTHY: A bill (H.R. 7247) to place the production and marketing of wheat on a sound commercial

basis and to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting wheat into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORD: A bill (H.R. 7248) to assure the persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 7249) to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H.R. 7250) to further provide for the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H.R. 7251) to authorize the construction and use of an underground pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H.R. 7252) authorizing the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H.R. 7253) to promote the health of the people of the United States and to encourage the dairy industry in the interest of the general welfare; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7254) to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine", approved August 2, 1886, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H.R. 7255) for the relief of the Winnebago Indians residing in school district no. 17, Thurston County, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7256) for the relief of the Omaha Indians residing in school district no. 16, Thurston County, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H.R. 7257) authorizing the President of the United States to extend the time for awarding decorations to the participants of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H.R. 7258) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H.R. 7259) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. McCARTHY: A bill (H.R. 7260) to place the wheat-producing industry on a sound economic basis, and to provide additional revenue for extraordinary expense incurred by reason of a national emergency; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H.R. 7261) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GASQUE (by request): A bill (H.R. 7262) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and their widows

and dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H.R. 7263) to provide redress for employees in the competitive classified service of the United States in matters of removal, reduction in rank or salary, suspension from duty, and other disciplinary actions; to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (38 Stat. 555), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: Joint Resolution (H.J.Res. 238) authorizing the issuance of notes and silver to honor President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 239) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also joint resolution (H.J.Res. 240) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRUAX: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 241) to prohibit members and employees of any national political committee from holding Government positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 242) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 243) to provide for the replacement of certain markers in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 244) to make available to Congress the services and data of the Interstate Reference Bureau; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of South Carolina, memorializing Congress through the Federal Public Works Administration to undertake the development of the Santee-Cooper River hydroelectric and navigation project, and urging its relation to the national plan of recovery now under way; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENS: A bill (H.R. 7264) for the relief of M. N. Lipinski; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7265) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota, Scott County and Carver County, in the State of Minnesota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Minnesota River, at or near Jordan, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Nebraska: A bill (H.R. 7266) authorizing the Treasurer of the United States to refund to the Farmers' Grain Co., of Omaha, Nebr., income taxes illegally paid to the United States Treasury; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIES: A bill (H.R. 7267) to authorize the presentation of the Distinguished Service Cross to Robert H. Wyche; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H.R. 7268) for the relief of Alice Shriner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7269) granting a pension to Cora E. Kuderski; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: A bill (H.R. 7270) for the relief of A. E. Shelley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7271) for the relief of Mary F. Platten; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7272) for the relief of John W. Adair; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7273) for the relief of George Stoll and the heirs of Charles P. Regan, Marshall Turley, Edward Lannigan, James Manley, and John Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7274) for the relief of Edward P. Oldham, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7275) granting a pension to Rafael Lugo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7276) for the relief of James P. Liakopoulos; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7277) for the relief of Jessie Blout; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7278) for the relief of W. I. Johnson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H.R. 7279) for the relief of Porter Bros. & Biffle and certain other citizens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLOEB: A bill (H.R. 7280) for the relief of Paul Winters York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H.R. 7281) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7282) granting a pension to Anson H. Longwith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7283) granting a pension to Sarah Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 7284) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Kohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. McCARTHY: A bill (H.R. 7285) for the relief of Harry Elward Moore; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H.R. 7286) for the relief of George Luftman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H.R. 7287) for the relief of Edward H. Cotcher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H.R. 7288) granting a pension to Marilla Andrews Buckwalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H.R. 7289) for the relief of H. A. Soderberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEYSER: A bill (H.R. 7290) authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H.R. 7291) authorizing the city of Hannibal, Mo., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Hannibal, Marion County, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H.R. 7292) for the relief of the Boston Store Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H.R. 7293) granting an increase of pension to William Hargis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WITHROW: A bill (H.R. 7294) granting a pension to William Edward Coughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1733. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Winnebago County Civil Works Administration Work Committee, urging continuance of the Civil Works Administration program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1734. By Mr. BURNHAM: Petition signed by 57 residents of San Diego County, Calif., urging the restoration to all veterans who were actually disabled in the Military or Naval Service their former benefits, rights, privileges, ratings, schedules, compensation, presumptions, and pensions heretofore enjoyed by them and existent prior to the enactment of the said Economy Act; to the Committee on Pensions.

1735. Also, petition signed by 308 residents of San Diego County, Calif., urging the restoration of pensions, hospitali-

zation, and care of veterans of the Spanish-American War as same existed prior to the enactment of Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on Pensions.

1736. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of the Detroit Federation of Post Office Clerks of Local No. 295, Detroit, Mich., demanding that all employees in the service of the Federal Government, who have 30 years or more service, be retired without prejudice or discrimination; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1737. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by Mr. and Mrs. T. Bullochus, of 2401 Fenton Avenue, Bronx, New York City, N.Y., and a number of other residents of the Bronx, urging Congress to stand behind the President on his monetary program; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1738. By Mr. GOODWIN: Letter dated January 19, 1934, from A. W. Brandt, commissioner, department of public works, division of highways, State of New York, making a plea for a further grant to the Highway Department of the State of New York, together with a folder from the American Association of State Highway Officials showing the necessity for such grant, and increasing the appropriations under the National Recovery Act to cover highways; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1739. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Resolution of the Associated Commercial Clubs of Black Hills, urging that appropriations be made, and provisions included, in the Budget presented to Congress for continuance of the operations and activities of the experiment farm at Newell, S.Dak., after July 1, 1934; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1740. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of Mount Carmel Guild of Jersey City, N.J., registering protest of 120,000 Catholic women, members of the Mount Carmel Guild of the Diocese of Newark, N.J., protesting against the passage of House bill 5978, known as the "birth-control bill"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1741. Also, petition of the legislative committee of the Newark Diocesan Federation of Holy Name Societies, representing upward of 100,000 men, with headquarters in the city of Newark, State of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of House bill 5978, which is an amendment to the Criminal Code relating to birth control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1742. By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: Petition of the Veterans' Law Observance Union, of Meriden, Conn., protesting against existing regulations affecting war veterans' benefits and asking remedial legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1743. By Mr. GLOVER: Resolution of Senator Marvin B. Norfleet, of Arkansas; to the Committee on Education.

1744. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Grant County farmers, Grant County, Minn., favoring enactment of the Frazier bill and striking against the payment of either interest or principal of debts and against being refinanced until a rate of interest comparable to rates charged foreign governments be granted to farmers of the United States, and that debts be scaled down to compare to present farm-land values and commodity values as compared to the time loan was made; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1745. Also, petition of American Legion Post, Mora, Minn., endorsing American Legion legislative program; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1746. Also, petition of substitute letter carriers of Minneapolis, Minn., and members of branch no. 9, National Association of Letter Carriers, asking restoration of pay cut and relief of condition of substitute postal carriers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1747. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Hawley & Hoops, confectionery manufacturers, New York City, opposing excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1748. Also, petition of Francis L. Pruyn, New York City, favoring passage of House bill 5632, the duck stamp bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1749. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Hawley & Hoops, New York City, favoring the repeal of the excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1750. Also, petition of J. T. Matchett Co., Brooklyn, N.Y., favoring the repeal of the present excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1751. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Detroit Board of Commerce, advocating relief from automobile taxation and encouragement of motor-car ownership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1752. Also, petition of the Michigan House of Representatives, asking aid and assistance to the bean growers of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1753. Also, petition of the Michigan House of Representatives, asking the enactment of the Sumners House bill 5950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1754. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to aid and assist industry, and particularly the small business man; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1755. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish uniform rules and regulations for the movement of all commodities in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1934

(Legislative day of Tuesday, Jan. 23, 1934)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported favorably the nomination of George M. Brennan, of Illinois, to be Intermediate Credit Commissioner in the Farm Credit Administration, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Stephen M. Driscoll, of St. Albans, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt., in place of Fred B. Thomas, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Clinton R. Barry, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney, western district of Arkansas, to succeed William N. Ivie, whose term expired January 20, 1934, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed legislative session.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS IN GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Public Printer, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers on the files of the United States Government Printing Office that are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and also calling attention to a letter from the Public Printer of February 25, 1933, on the same subject, and asking for action looking toward the disposition of such useless papers, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. VANDENBERG the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Bernard Cash, commander Spanish War Veterans, Department of Utah, praying for the restoration of pension laws in force before the passage of the so-called "Economy Act", which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the State of California, praying for the passage of legislation to restore to all veterans who were actually disabled in the military or naval service the benefits, rights, privileges, ratings, schedules, compensation, presumptions, and pensions enjoyed by them prior to the enactment of the so-called "Economy Act", which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of E. B. and F. E. Willis, of Erie, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation remonetizing silver and improving the monetary system, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of Local Union No. 8, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the bill (H.R. 6976) to protect the currency system of the United States, to provide for the better use of the monetary gold stock of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition numerously signed by sundry citizens of Arkansas City, Wichita, the Veterans' Administration Home, Garden City, and Dodge City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the abolition of the pay cut affecting Federal employees under the provisions of the so-called "Economy Act", which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Senate Resolution 4 (Introduced by Senator Norfleet)

Whereas there now exists a staggering indebtedness in the State of Arkansas, incurred for educational purposes of various characters, outstanding in secured and open-account form, outstanding against property of affected school districts, and taxpayers therein are required to pay same, causing an enormous drain of taxes and revenues; and

Whereas our Federal Government was organized along the lines of a free people and with the guaranty of those things dear to the hearts of freemen and necessary in the enjoyment of the privileges so extended, amongst which is the acquisition of an education provided by the State, and burdensome taxation now exists by reason thereof which, when coupled with other contemporary taxation derived from the public purse of the citizenship of the State, constitutes a measure of payment unbearable to all affected: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved by the senate in special session duly assembled in January 1934, That the Federal Government be hereby memorialized as a part of its \$16,000,000,000 program of public relief to assist the State program of education as to assisting payment of said indebtedness, so that posterity may be thus served while relieving the present distress occasioned by the burdensome indebtedness existing for educational purposes of the affected children of the State; and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of this senate to each Arkansas Representative and Senator in the National Congress.

Mr. CAREY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, favoring the creation and establishment of an additional Federal land-bank district comprising the States of New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. ADAMS on the 23d instant, p. 1128, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. CAREY also presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

THE STATE OF WYOMING, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Wyoming, ss:

I, A. M. Clark, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 2, senate, of the special session of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original Senate Joint Memorial No. 2, approved by the Governor on December 27, 1933, at 3:36 p.m. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 4th day of January, A.D. 1934.

[SEAL]

A. M. CLARK, Secretary of State.
By C. J. ROGERS, Deputy.